arXiv:0707.1743v2 [math.NT] 21 May 2008

RELATIVE LOG CONVERGENT COHOMOLOGY AND RELATIVE RIGID COHOMOLOGY II

ATSUSHI SHIHO

Abstract. In this paper, we develop the theory of relative log convergent cohomology of radius λ $(0 < \lambda \leq 1)$, which is a generalization of the notion of relative log convergent cohomology in the previous paper. By comparing this cohomology with relative log crystalline cohomology, relative rigid cohomology and its variants and by using some technique of hypercovering, we prove a version of Berthelot's conjecture on the overconvergence of relative rigid cohomology for proper smooth families.

Contents

Introduction 1
Convention 5
1. Relative log convergent cohomology of radius λ (I) 5
2. Relative log convergent cohomology of radius λ (II) 25
3. Relative log analytic cohomology of radius λ 30
4. Relative log rigid cohomology and its λ-restriction 36
5. Relative rigid cohomology (I): log smooth case 52
6. Preliminaries on alteration and hypercovering 58
7. Relative rigid cohomology (II): general case 68
References 79

Introduction

Let k be a perfect field of characteristic $p > 0$, let V be a complete discrete valuation ring of mixed characteristic with residue field k and let X be a scheme separated of finite type over k. Then it is expected that the correct p-adic analogue on X of the notion of local systems in complex analytic case or that of smooth l-adic sheaves in l-adic case is the notion of overconvergent F-isocrystals on X, which is defined by Berthelot ([B2], [B3]). So, when we are given a proper smooth morphism $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ and an overconvergent F-isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ on X, the higher direct image of $\mathcal{E}$ (= relative rigid cohomology of X/Y with coefficient $\mathcal{E}$, [B2], [Ch-T]) should have the canonical structure of an overconvergent F-isocrystal. This is the content of Berthelot's conjecture on the coherence and the overconvergence of relative rigid cohomology. (As we noted in [S3, §5] and we will repeat again in this introduction,

---

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): 14F30.

one can consider several versions of this conjecture. See also [B2, (4.3)], [T3, §4].) The purpose of this paper is to prove a version of Berthelot's conjecture.

Let me introduce some terminologies and give some explanation on Berthelot's conjecture. In this introduction, a pair $(X, \overline{X})$ is a pair of schemes $X, \overline{X}$ separated of finite type over k endowed with an open immersion $X \hookrightarrow \overline{X}$. A triple $(X, \overline{X}, \mathcal{X})$ is a pair $(X, \overline{X})$ endowed with a p-adic formal scheme $\mathcal{X}$ separated, topologically of finite type over $\mathrm{Spf}\, V$ and a closed immersion $\overline{X} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X}$ over $\mathrm{Spf}\, V$. For a triple of the form $(S, S, \mathcal{S})$ and a pair $(X, \overline{X})$ over (S, S), an $(X, \overline{X})$-triple over $(S, S, \mathcal{S})$ is a triple $(Y, \overline{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ over $(S, S, \mathcal{S})$ endowed with a morphism of pairs $(Y, \overline{Y}) \longrightarrow (X, \overline{X})$ over (S, S). Then Berthelot's conjecture is described as follows ([S3, 5.3]):

Conjecture 0.1. *Let us take a triple of the form* $(S, S, \mathcal{S})$ (*endowed with a lift of Frobenius on* $\mathcal{S}$) *and assume we are given a diagram of pairs*

$$(X, \overline{X}) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, \overline{Y}) \xrightarrow{g} (S, S)$$

such that $f : \overline{X} \longrightarrow \overline{Y}$ *is proper,* $f^{-1}(Y) = X$ *and that* $f|_X : X \longrightarrow Y$ *is smooth. Then, for an overconvergent* (F-)*isocrystal* $\mathcal{E}$ *on* $(X, \overline{X})/\mathcal{S}_K$ *and* $q \geq 0$, *there exists uniquely an overconvergent* (F-)*isocrystal* $\mathcal{F}$ (*which is called the* q-*th rigid cohomology overconvergent isocrystal*) *on* $(Y, \overline{Y})/\mathcal{S}_K$ *satisfying the following condition*: *For any* $(Y, \overline{Y})$-*triple* $(Z, \overline{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ *over* $(S, S, \mathcal{S})$ *with* $\mathcal{Z}$ *formally smooth over* $\mathcal{S}$ *on a neighborhood of* Z, *the restriction of* $\mathcal{F}$ *to* $I^\dagger((Z, \overline{Z})/\mathcal{S}_K, \mathcal{Z})$ *is given functorially by* $(R^q f_{(X\times_Y Z, \overline{X}\times_{\overline{Y}}\overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}, \epsilon)$, *where* ϵ *is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} p_2^* R^q f_{(X\times_Y Z, \overline{X}\times_{\overline{Y}}\overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E} &\xrightarrow{\simeq} R^q f_{(X\times_Y Z, \overline{X}\times_{\overline{Y}}\overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}\times_{\mathcal{S}}\mathcal{Z},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E} \\ &\xleftarrow{\simeq} p_1^* R^q f_{(X\times_Y Z, \overline{X}\times_{\overline{Y}}\overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}. \end{aligned}$$

(*Here* $I^\dagger((Z, \overline{Z})/\mathcal{S}_K, \mathcal{Z})$ *denotes the category of overconvergent isocrystals on* $(Z, \overline{Z})/\mathcal{S}_K$ *over* $\mathcal{Z}$, $R^q f_{(X\times_Y Z, \overline{X}\times_{\overline{Y}}\overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}$, $R^q f_{(X\times_Y Z, \overline{X}\times_{\overline{Y}}\overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}\times_{\mathcal{S}}\mathcal{Z},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}$ *are relative rigid cohomologies and* p_i *is the morphism* $]\overline{Z}[_{\mathcal{Z}\times_{\mathcal{S}}\mathcal{Z}} \longrightarrow]\overline{Z}[_{\mathcal{Z}}$ *induced by the* i-*th projection.*)

We would like to consider the following version of Berthelot's conjecture ([S3, 5.5]), which is slightly weaker than Conjecture 0.1 but strong enough to assure the unique existence of 'the q-th rigid cohomology overconvergent isocrystal':

Conjecture 0.2. *Let us take a triple of the form* $(S, S, \mathcal{S})$ (*endowed with a lift of Frobenius on* $\mathcal{S}$) *and assume we are given a diagram of pairs*

$$(X, \overline{X}) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, \overline{Y}) \xrightarrow{g} (S, S)$$

such that $f : \overline{X} \longrightarrow \overline{Y}$ *is proper,* $f^{-1}(Y) = X$ *and that* $f|_X : X \longrightarrow Y$ *is smooth. Then there exists a subcategory* $\mathcal{C}$ *of the category of* $(Y, \overline{Y})$-*triples over* $(S, S, \mathcal{S})$ *such that, for an overconvergent* (F-)*isocrystal* $\mathcal{E}$ *on* $(X, \overline{X})/\mathcal{S}_K$ *and* $q \geq 0$, *there exists uniquely an overconvergent* (F-)*isocrystal* $\mathcal{F}$ (*which is called the* q-*th rigid cohomology overconvergent isocrystal*) *on* $(Y, \overline{Y})/\mathcal{S}_K$ *satisfying the following condition*: *For any* $(Z, \overline{Z}, \mathcal{Z}) \in \mathcal{C}$ *with* $\mathcal{Z}$ *formally smooth over* $\mathcal{S}$ *on a neighborhood of* Z, *the restriction of* $\mathcal{F}$ *to* $I^\dagger((Z, \overline{Z})/\mathcal{S}_K, \mathcal{Z})$ *is given functorially by* $(R^q f_{(X\times_Y Z, \overline{X}\times_{\overline{Y}}\overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}, \epsilon)$, *where ϵ is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} p_2^* R^q f_{(X\times_Y Z, \overline{X}\times_{\overline{Y}}\overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E} &\xrightarrow{\simeq} R^q f_{(X\times_Y Z, \overline{X}\times_{\overline{Y}}\overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}\times_{\mathcal{S}}\mathcal{Z},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E} \\ &\xleftarrow{\simeq} p_1^* R^q f_{(X\times_Y Z, \overline{X}\times_{\overline{Y}}\overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}. \end{aligned}$$

(*Here the notations are as in Conjecture 0.1.*)

The difference of Conjecture 0.2 compared to Conjecture 0.1 is the introduction of the category $\mathcal{C}$: Conjecture 0.2 is weaker than Conjecture 0.1 in the sense that $\mathcal{C}$ need not be equal to the category of all $(Y,\overline{Y})$-triples $(Z,\overline{Z},\mathcal{Z})$ over $(S,S,\mathcal{S})$. However, Conjecture 0.2 is strong enough to require the unique existence of $\mathcal{F}$. As long as we know, there is no non-trivial example for which Conjecture 0.1 is known. On the other hand, Conjecture 0.2 is known in liftable case ([B2, Thm 5], [T3, 4.1.4], see also [S3, 5.7]) and the case where the morphism $f:\overline{X}\longrightarrow\overline{Y}$ admits a 'nice' log structure and $\mathcal{E}$ comes from a locally free isocrystal on log convergent site $(\overline{X}/\mathcal{S})^{\log}_{\mathrm{conv}}$. (For precise statement, see [S3, 5.14, 5.15].) The main result in this paper is the following theorems (= Theorems 7.6, 7.10 in this paper).

Theorem 0.3. *In the situation of Conjecture 0.2* (*without a lift of Frobenius on $\mathcal{S}$*)*, assume moreover that $\mathcal{S}=\mathrm{Spf}\,V$ and Y is smooth over k. Then Conjecture 0.2* (*the version without Frobenius structure*) *is true.*

Theorem 0.4. *In the situation of Conjecture 0.2* (*with a lift of Frobenius on $\mathcal{S}$*)*, assume moreover that $\mathcal{S}=\mathrm{Spf}\,V$. Then Conjecture 0.2* (*the version with Frobenius structure*) *is true.*

In the course of the proof of or as variants of the above theorems, we also prove the following results:

(a) If $f:\overline{X}\longrightarrow\overline{Y}$ admits a nice log structure and $\mathcal{E}$ is locally free, then Conjecture 0.2 (the version without Frobenius structure) is true, without any assumption on $Y,\mathcal{S}$ (Theorem 5.2). Moreover, if $S=\mathrm{Spf}\,V$, the version with Frobenius structure is also true (Theorem 7.9).
(b) Even if we do not assume the smoothness of f, the analogue of Conjecture 0.2 (the version without Frobenius structure) is true for locally free $\mathcal{E}$, if we shrink Y (Theorem 7.4). Moreover, if $S=\mathrm{Spf}\,V$, the version with Frobenius structure is also true (Theorem 7.9).
(c) Theorem 0.3 is true without the assumption of smoothness on Y if we assume the full-faithfulness conjecture of Tsuzuki ([T1, 1.2.1], see also Conjecture 7.7) (Theorem 7.8).

Now we give an outline of the proof of Theorems 0.3, 0.4 and explain the content of this paper. The key to the proof is the comparison of the following six cohomology theories:

(1) Relative log crystalline cohomology ([Kat], see also [S3, §1]).
(2) Relative log convergent cohomology of radius λ ($\lambda\in(0,1]$).
(3) Relative log analytic cohomology of radius λ ($\lambda\in(0,1]$).

(4) λ-restriction of relative log rigid cohomology $(\lambda \in (0,1))$.
(5) Relative log rigid cohomology.
(6) Relative rigid cohomology.

First, in Section 1, we introduce the notion of relative log convergent cohomology of radius λ and prove the comparison theorem with relative log crystalline cohomology when λ is sufficiently close to 1. In the case $\lambda = 1$, relative log convergent cohomology of radius λ is the same as relative log convergent cohomology which was introduced in [S3], [N-S]. In Section 2, by using the results in Section 1 and the technique developped in [S3, §3], we prove the finiteness and the base change property of relative log convergent cohomology of radius λ for proper log smooth integral morphism having log smooth parameter (for definition, see Definition 2.6 or [S3, 3.4]) when λ is sufficiently close to 1. In Section 3, we introduce the notion of relative log analytic cohomology of radius λ and prove a relation of it with relative log convergent cohomology of radius λ. Using this, we prove a kind of the coherence and the convergence property of relative log analytic cohomology of radius λ for proper log smooth integral morphism having log smooth parameter. In Section 4, first we introduce the notion of a log pair and an overconvergent isocrystal on it. Then, for a morphism of log pairs and an overconvergent isocrystal on the source, we define the notion of relative log rigid cohomology. Then we relate it to the relative rigid cohomology (defined in [B2], [Ch-T]) in certain case. After that, we introduce the notion of λ-restriction of relative log rigid cohomology and compare it with relative rigid cohomology when λ is sufficiently close to 1. In Section 5, we prove the assertion (a) (the version without Frobenius structure) above: By the results proved up to Section 4, relative log analytic cohomology of radius λ has certain coherence property and relative rigid cohomology is related to the λ-restriction of relative log rigid cohomology. So we compare the relative log analytic cohomology of radius λ and the λ-restriction of relative log rigid cohomology. To deduce the assertion (a), the base change theorem of relative rigid cohomology proved by Tsuzuki [T3, 2.3.1] is also important. In Section 6, we prove a result of altering a given proper morphism of schemes over k to a certain simplicial morphism of schemes whose components admit nice log structures, by using results of de Jong [dJ], [dJ2]. This result allows us to reduce the proof of the main theorems to the case of proper log smooth integral morphisms having log smooth parameter. Indeed, in Section 7, first we prove the assertion (b) (the version without Frobenius structure) by combining the results in Sections 5 and 6. Then, by combining this with (a special case of) the main result of [S3] and a result of Kedlaya in [Ke1] on the extendability of overconvergent isocrystals, we prove Theorem 0.3. Finally, by working slightly more, we prove the assertion (c), the assertions (a), (b) (the version with Frobenius structure) and Theorem 0.4.

The author would like to thank to Nobuo Tsuzuki and Makoto Matsumoto for inviting him to give a talk at a conference held at Hiroshima University, and to Takeshi Tsuji for encouraging him to give a talk at a conference held at Tambara Institute for Mathematical Sciences. The author would like to thank to Kiran Kedlaya for kindly sending the preprint [Ke2]. The author is partly supported by

Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B), the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan and JSPS Core-to-Core program 18005 whose representative is Makoto Matsumoto.

Convention

(1) Throughout this paper, k is a field of characteristic $p > 0$, W is a fixed Cohen ring of k and K is the fraction field of W. As we will remark in the text, we will assume that k is perfect in Sections 6 and 7. We fix a p-adic fine log formal scheme $(\mathcal{B}, M_{\mathcal{B}})$ separated and topologically of finite type over $\mathrm{Spf}\, W$ as a base log formal scheme. (Note that $\mathcal{B}$ is Noetherian.) We denote the scheme $(\mathcal{B}, M_{\mathcal{B}}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ by (B, M_B). We denote the category of fine log (not necessarily p-adic) formal schemes which are separated and topologically of finite type over $(\mathcal{B}, M_{\mathcal{B}})$ by $(\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ and denote the full subcategory of $(\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ which consists of p-adic ones by $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$. We denote the full subcategory of $(\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ which consists of usual fine log schemes by $(\mathrm{LS}/\mathcal{B})$ and the full subcategory which consists of fine log schemes over (B, M_B) by (LS/B). We call an object in $(\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ a fine log formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme, an object in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ a p-adic fine log formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme, an object in $(\mathrm{LS}/\mathcal{B})$ a fine log $\mathcal{B}$-scheme and an object in (LS/B) a fine log B-scheme. (When log structure is trivial, we omit the term 'fine log'.) Note that, in Sections 4–7, we will impose more assumptions on $\mathcal{B}$.

(2) For a formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme T, we denote the rigid analytic space assocated to T by T_K.

(3) In this paper, we freely use terminologies concerning log structures defined in [Kat], [S1] and [S2]. For a fine log (formal) scheme (X, M_X), $(X, M_X)_{\mathrm{triv}}$ denotes the maximal open sub (formal) scheme of X on which the log structure M_X is trivial. A morphism $f : (X, M_X) \longrightarrow (Y, M_Y)$ is said to be strict if $f^*M_Y = M_X$ holds.

(4) For a site $\mathcal{S}$, we will denote the topos associated to $\mathcal{S}$ by $\mathcal{S}^{\sim}$.

(5) Fiber products of log formal schemes are completed unless otherwise stated. On the other hand, the completed tensor pruduct of topological modules are denoted by $\hat{\otimes}$ to distinguish with the usual tensor product $\otimes$.

1. Relative log convergent cohomology of radius λ (I)

In this section, first we introduce the notion of relative log convergent site of radius λ ($0 < \lambda \leq 1$), which is a generalization of the relative log convergent site introduced in [S3, 2.4]. Then we prove some basic properties of it and we prove the log convergent Poincaré lemma for this site. After that, we prove the comparison theorem between relative log convergent cohomology of radius λ with relative log crystalline cohomology when λ is sufficiently close to 1. The proof is similar to that given in [S3, §2] but slightly more complicated.

First let us recall the definition of pre-widening, widening and enlargement, which was defined in [S3, Definition 2.1, 2.2]:

Definition 1.1. *Let $f : (\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ be a morphism in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$. Define the category $\mathcal{Q}((\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$ of quadruples on $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}})/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ as follows: The objects* *are the data* $((\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), (Z, M_Z), i, z)$, *where* $(\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}})$ *is an object in* $(\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ *over* $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$, (Z, M_Z) *is an object in* $(\mathrm{LS}/\mathcal{B})$ *over* $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$, i *is a closed immersion* $(Z, M_Z) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}})$ *over* $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ *and* z *is a morphism* $(Z, M_Z) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}})$ *in* $(\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ *over* $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$. *We define a morphism of quadruples on* $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}})/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ *in an obvious way.* (*See* [S2, 2.1.8].)

Definition 1.2. *Let* $f : (\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ *be as above.*
(1) *A quadruple* $((\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), (Z, M_Z), i, z)$ *on* $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}})/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ *is called a pre-widening on* $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}})/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ *if* $\mathcal{Z}$ *is in* $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$.
(2) *A quadruple* $((\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), (Z, M_Z), i, z)$ *on* $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}})/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ *is called a widening on* $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}})/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ *if* i *is a homeomorphic closed immersion* (*that is, if* Z *is a scheme of definition of* $\mathcal{Z}$ *via* i).
(3) *A* (*pre-*)*widening* $((\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), (Z, M_Z), i, z)$ *on* $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}})/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ *is said to be exact if* i *is exact. It is said to be affine if* $\mathcal{Z}, z$ *and the structure morphism* $\mathcal{Z} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ *are affine.*
(4) *A quadruple* $((\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), (Z, M_Z), i, z)$ *on* $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}})/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ *is called an enlargement if it is both pre-widening and widening, it is exact and* $\mathcal{Z}$ *is flat over* $\mathrm{Spf}\, W$.

We introduce the notion of the radius of an enlargement, which is one of the key notion in this paper.

Definition 1.3. (1) *For a sheaf of rings* $\mathcal{A}$ *on a site and a sheaf of ideals* $\mathcal{I}$ *of* $\mathcal{A}$, *we define* $r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}) \in [0, \infty]$ *by* $r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}) := \sup\{b/a \,|\, \mathcal{I}^a \subseteq p^b \mathcal{A}\}$.

(2) *Let* $f : (\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ *be a morphism in* $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$, *let* $\mathcal{Z} := ((\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), (Z, M_Z), i, z)$ *be an enlargement of* $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}})/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ *and put* $\mathcal{I} := \mathrm{Ker}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z)$. *Then we define* $r(\mathcal{Z})$ *by* $r(\mathcal{Z}) := r(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}, \mathcal{I})$ *and call it the logarithmic radius of* $\mathcal{Z}$. *We define* $\lambda(\mathcal{Z})$ *by*

$$\lambda(\mathcal{Z}) := p^{-r(\mathcal{Z})} = \inf\{p^{-b/a} \,|\, \mathcal{I}^a \subseteq p^b \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}\}$$

and call it the radius of $\mathcal{Z}$. *By definition, we have* $r(\mathcal{Z}) \in (0, \infty)$ *and* $\lambda(\mathcal{Z}) \in (0, 1)$.

We prove basic properties of $r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I})$ which we will use later.

Lemma 1.4. *Let* $\mathcal{A}$ *be as above.*

1. *For sheaves of ideals* $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}$ *of* $\mathcal{A}$, *we have* $(r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I})^{-1} + r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{J})^{-1})^{-1} \leq r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{J})$. *Moreover, if* $r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{J}) = \infty$ (*this is the case if, for example,* $\mathcal{J}$ *is nilpotent*), *we have* $r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}) = r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{J})$.
2. *For sheaves* $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ *of* $\mathcal{A}$ *such that* $\mathcal{J}$ *is nilpotent, we have* $r(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I}/\mathcal{J}) = r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I})$.

Proof. If we have $\mathcal{I}^a \subseteq p^b \mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{J}^{a'} \subseteq p^{b'} \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$(\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{J})^{ab' + a'b} \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{ab'} + \mathcal{J}^{a'b} \subseteq p^{bb'} \mathcal{A}.$$

The former assertion of (1) follows from this. the latter assertion follows from the inequality

$$r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}) = (r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I})^{-1} + \infty^{-1})^{-1} \leq r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{J}) \leq r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}).$$

Next let us prove (2). If we have $\mathcal{I}^a \subseteq p^b\mathcal{A}$, we have $(\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{J})^a \subseteq p^b(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{J})$. On the other hand, assume we have $(\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{J})^a \subseteq p^b(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{J})$. Then we have $\mathcal{I}^a \subseteq p^b\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{J}$. If we take $N \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $\mathcal{J}^{N+1} = 0$, we have, for any $n \geq N$, the inclusion

$$\mathcal{I}^{an} \subseteq (p^b\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{J})^n \subseteq p^{b(n-N)}\mathcal{A}.$$

From this, we can deduce the equality $r(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I}/\mathcal{J}) = r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I})$. □

Now we give the definition of relative log convergent site of radius λ and the category of isocrystals on it, as follows:

Definition 1.5. *Let τ be one of the words $\{\mathrm{Zar}(=\text{Zariski}), \mathrm{et}(=\text{etale})\}$. For a morphism $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ and $\lambda \in (0,1]$, we define the log convergent site $(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau}$ of $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}})/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ of radius λ with respect to τ-topology as follows: The objects are the enlargements $\mathcal{Z}$ on $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}})/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ with $\lambda(\mathcal{Z}) < \lambda$ and the morphisms are the morphism of enlargements. A family of morphisms*

$$\{((\mathcal{Z}_\alpha, M_{\mathcal{Z}_\alpha}), (Z_\alpha, M_{Z_\alpha}), i_\alpha, z_\alpha) \longrightarrow ((\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), (Z, M_Z), i, z)\}_{\alpha \in I}$$

is a covering if the morphisms $(\mathcal{Z}_\alpha, M_{\mathcal{Z}_\alpha}) \to (\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}})$ are strict, form a covering of $\mathcal{Z}$ with respect to τ-topology and (Z_α, M_{Z_α}) is canonically isomorphic to $(\mathcal{Z}_\alpha, M_{\mathcal{Z}_\alpha}) \times_{(\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), i} (Z, M_Z)$. When the log structures are trivial, we omit the superscript $^{\log}$ in $(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau}$. We denote the right derived functor (resp. the q-th right derived functor) of the functor

$$(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log,\sim}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Y}^{\sim}_{\mathrm{Zar}};\ \mathcal{E} \mapsto (U \mapsto \Gamma((\mathcal{X} \times_{\mathcal{Y}} U/U)^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau}, \mathcal{E}))$$

by $Rf_{\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}$ (resp. $R^q f_{\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}$). We call $R^q f_{\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}$ the q-th relative log convergent cohomology of $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}})/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ with coefficient $\mathcal{E}$.

Remark 1.6.
1. When λ is equal to 1, $(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau}$ is nothing but the relative log convergent site $(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\mathrm{conv},\tau}$ defined in [S3, 2.4].
2. For a morphism of enlargements $g : \mathcal{Z}' := ((\mathcal{Z}', M_{\mathcal{Z}'}), (Z', M_{Z'}), i', z') \longrightarrow ((\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), (Z, M_Z), i, z) =: \mathcal{Z}$ satisfying $(\mathcal{Z}', M_{\mathcal{Z}'}) \times_{(\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), i} (Z, M_Z) = (Z', M_{Z'})$, we have $\lambda(\mathcal{Z}') \leq \lambda(\mathcal{Z})$. So the category of coverings of an object $\mathcal{Z}$ in $(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau}$ is equal to the category of coverings of $\mathcal{Z}$ when considered in $(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\mathrm{conv},\tau}$.

Definition 1.7. *Let the notations be as above. An isocrystal on the log convergent site of radius λ $(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau}$ is a sheaf $\mathcal{E}$ on $(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau}$ satisfying the following conditions:*

1. *For any object $\mathcal{Z}$ in $(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau}$, the sheaf $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Z}}$ on $\mathcal{Z}$ induced by $\mathcal{E}$ is an isocoherent sheaf. (That is, $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Z}}$ has the form $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathcal{F}$ a coherent $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}$-module.)*
2. *For any morphism $f : \mathcal{Z}' \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ in $(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau}$, the homomorphism $f^*\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Z}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Z}'}$ of sheaves on $\mathcal{Z}'$ induced by $\mathcal{E}$ is an isomorphism.*

We denote the category of isocrystals on $(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau}$ by $I_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau}((\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$. When the log structures are trivial, we omit the superscript $^{\log}$.

Definition 1.8. *Let the notations be as above. Then an isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ is said to be locally free if, for any enlargement $\mathcal{Z}$, the sheaf $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Z}}$ on $\mathcal{Z}$ induced by $\mathcal{E}$ is a locally free $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}$-module in the sense of* [S3, 1.9]. (*Note that it does not mean that $\mathcal{E}$ is a free $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}$-module locally on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{Zar}}$.*)

For a morphism $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ and a (pre-)widening $\mathcal{Z}$ on $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}})/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$, we can define the notion of localized log convergent site of radius λ $(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau}|_{\mathcal{Z}}$ and the category of isocrystals $I_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau}((\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}|_{\mathcal{Z}})$ on it. Also, for a simplicial object $(\mathcal{X}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{X}^{(\bullet)}})$ in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ and a morphism $(\mathcal{X}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{X}^{(\bullet)}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$, we can define the relative log convergent topos $(\mathcal{X}^{(\bullet)}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log,\sim}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau}$ of radius λ. As in [S3, 2.7] and [S2, 2.1.20], we have the following:

Proposition 1.9. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ be a morphism in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ and let τ be one of the words $\{\mathrm{Zar}(=\text{Zariski}), \mathrm{et}(=\text{etale})\}$. Let $g^{(\bullet)} : (\mathcal{X}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{X}^{(\bullet)}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}})$ be a strict τ-hypercovering of $\mathcal{X}$. Let $\theta := (\theta_*, \theta^{-1}) : (\mathcal{X}^{(\bullet)}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log,\sim}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log,\sim}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau}$ be the morphism of topoi characterized by $\theta^{-1}(E)^{(i)} := g^{(i),-1}(E)$. Then, for any abelian sheaf E on $(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau}$, the canonical homomorphism $E \longrightarrow R\theta_*\theta^{-1}E$ is a quasi-isomorphism.*

We also need a similar but slightly different descent property, which we will recall now. Let $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ be as above and assume we are given an open covering $\mathcal{X} = \bigcup_{j \in J} \mathcal{X}_j$ by finite number of sub formal schemes. For non-empty subset $L \subseteq J$, put $\mathcal{X}_L := \bigcap_{j \in L} \mathcal{X}_j, M_{\mathcal{X}_L} := M_{\mathcal{X}_j}|_{\mathcal{X}_L}$ and for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(\mathcal{X}^{(m)}, M_{\mathcal{X}^{(m)}})$ be the disjoint union of $(\mathcal{X}_L, M_{\mathcal{X}_L})$'s for $|L| = m+1$. ($\mathcal{X}^{(m)}$ is empty for $m \geq |J| =: N+1$.) Let Δ_N^+ be the category such that the objects are the sets $[m] := \{0, 1, 2, \cdots m\}$ with $m \leq N$ and that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\Delta_N^+}([m], [m'])$ is the set of strictly increasing maps $[m] \rightarrow [m']$. Then, if we fix a total order on J, we can regard $(\mathcal{X}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{X}^{(\bullet)}}) := \{(\mathcal{X}^{(m)}, M_{\mathcal{X}^{(m)}})\}_{0 \leq m \leq N}$ naturally as a diagram indexed by Δ_N^+ and we have a morphism $g^{(\bullet)} : (\mathcal{X}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{X}^{(\bullet)}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}})$. (cf. [S3, §1].) Then we have the following proposition, whose proof is the same as Proposition 1.9 (we omit it):

Proposition 1.10. *With the above notation, let $\theta := (\theta_*, \theta^{-1}) : (\mathcal{X}^{(\bullet)}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log,\sim}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log,\sim}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau}$ be the morphism of topoi characterized by $\theta^{-1}(E)^{(i)} := g^{(i),-1}(E)$. Then, for any abelian sheaf E on $(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau}$, the canonical homomorphism $E \longrightarrow R\theta_*\theta^{-1}E$ is a quasi-isomorphism.*

We have the following as in [S3, 2.9], [S2, 2.1.21]:

Proposition 1.11. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ be as above and let $\mathcal{Z}$ be a (pre-)widening of $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}})/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$. Let us denote the canonical morphism of topoi*

$$(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log,\sim}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\mathrm{et}} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log,\sim}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\mathrm{Zar}} \quad \textit{(resp. } (\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log,\sim}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\mathrm{et}}|_{\mathcal{Z}} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log,\sim}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\mathrm{Zar}}|_{\mathcal{Z}} \text{)}$$

by ϵ. Then:

1. *For any $\mathcal{E} \in I_{\lambda\text{-conv},\mathrm{et}}((\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$ (resp. $\mathcal{E} \in I_{\lambda\text{-conv},\mathrm{et}}((\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}|_{\mathcal{Z}})$), we have $R\epsilon_*\mathcal{E} = \epsilon_*\mathcal{E}$.*

(2) *The functor* $\mathcal{E} \mapsto \epsilon_*\mathcal{E}$ *induces the equivalence of categories*

$$I_{\lambda\text{-conv,et}}((\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \xrightarrow{\sim} I_{\lambda\text{-conv,Zar}}((\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$$
$$(\textit{resp.}\ I_{\lambda\text{-conv,et}}((\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}|_{\mathcal{Z}}) \xrightarrow{\sim} I_{\lambda\text{-conv,Zar}}((\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}|_{\mathcal{Z}})\ ).$$

In the rest of this paper, we denote the category $I_{\lambda\text{-conv,et}}((\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) = I_{\lambda\text{-conv,Zar}}((\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$ (resp. $I_{\lambda\text{-conv,et}}((\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}|_{\mathcal{Z}}) = I_{\lambda\text{-conv,Zar}}((\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}|_{\mathcal{Z}})$) simply by $I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$ (resp. $I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}|_{\mathcal{Z}})$) and call it an isocrystal on $(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv}}$ (resp. $(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv}}|_{\mathcal{Z}}$), by abuse of terminology.

Next we introduce the notion of the system of universal enlargements of radius λ, which is a generalization of the notion of the system of universal enlargements defined in [S3, 2.12]. To this end, first we define the oriented set which will be the index category of the system of universal enlargements:

Definition 1.12. *Let* $\mathbf{A}$ *be the set* $\{(a,b)\,|\,a,b \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}\}$. *For* $(a,b),(a',b') \in \mathbf{A}$, *we write* $(a,b) \succ\!\succ (a',b')$ *if* (a',b') *is equal to one of the elements* $(a+1,b),(a,b-1),(na,nb)$ (*for some* $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$). *We write* $(a,b) \succ (a',b')$ *if there exists a sequence of elements in* $\mathbf{A}$ *of the form*

$$(a,b) = (a_0,b_0) \succ\!\succ (a_1,b_1) \succ\!\succ \cdots \succ\!\succ (a_n,b_n) = (a',b').$$

For $r > 0$, *let* $\mathbf{A}_r$ *be the subset* $\{(a,b) \in \mathbf{A}\,|\,b/a > r\}$.

Lemma 1.13. *The relation* $\succ$ *defines a partial order on* $\mathbf{A}$ *and for any* $r > 0$, *the set* $\mathbf{A}_r$ *is oriented with respect to the order* $\succ$. (*That is, for any* $(a,b),(a',b') \in \mathbf{A}$, *there exists an element* (a'',b'') *in* $\mathbf{A}$ *with* $(a,b) \succ (a'',b''),(a',b') \succ (a'',b'')$.)

Proof. If we have $(a,b) \succ\!\succ (a',b')$, we have $b/a > b'/a'$ or $b/a = b'/a', a \leq a'$. So the same is true if we have $(a,b) \succ (a',b')$. Hence, if we have both $(a,b) \succ (a',b')$ and $(a',b') \succ (a,b)$, we have $b/a = b'/a', a = a'$. So we have $(a,b) = (a',b')$ and so $\succ$ is a partial order on $\mathbf{A}$.

If we have $(a,b),(a',b') \in \mathbf{A}_r$, we have $(a,b) \succ (a'',b''),(a',b') \succ (a'',b'')$ if we put $(a'',b'') := (aa', \min\{ab',a'b\})$. So $\mathbf{A}_r$ is oriented. □

Sometimes it is convenient to take a sequence which is cofinal with $\mathbf{A}_r$:

Definition 1.14. *A sequence* $\mathbf{a} := \{(a_n,b_n)\}$ *of elements of* $\mathbf{A}_r$ *is said to be a good sequence if the following conditions are satisfied*:

1. *We have* $(a_1,b_1) \succ (a_2,b_2) \succ \cdots$, $b_n/a_n > r\ (\forall n)$ *and* $\lim_{n\to\infty}(b_n/a_n) = r$.
2. a_{n+1} *is divisible by* a_n *for any* $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *and for any* $m \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, *there exists* $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that* a_n *is divisible by* m.

Lemma 1.15. *For any* $r > 0$, *there exists a good sequence* $\mathbf{a}$ *in* $\mathbf{A}_r$ *and any good sequence* $\mathbf{a}$ *in* $\mathbf{A}_r$ *is cofinal with respect to* $\succ$ *in* $\mathbf{A}_r$.

Proof. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $r_n := b_n/n!$ be the least rational number strictly bigger than r with denominator $n!$. Then one can check that the sequence $\{(n!,b_n)\}_n$ is a good sequence in $\mathbf{A}_r$.

Let us prove the latter statement. For any good sequence $\mathbf{a} := \{(a_n,b_n)\}$ in $\mathbf{A}_r$ and $(a,b) \in \mathbf{A}_r$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $b/a > b_n/a_n$ and that a_n is divisible by a. Then we have $(a,b) \succ (a_n,b_n)$. So $\mathbf{a}$ is cofinal in $\mathbf{A}_r$. □

Now we define the notion of the system of universal enlargements of radius λ. Let $\mathcal{Z} := ((\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), (Z, M_Z), i, z)$ be a (pre-)widening, let $((\mathcal{Z}^{\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{Z}^{\mathrm{ex}}}), (Z, M_Z), i^{\mathrm{ex}}, z)$ be the exactification of $\mathcal{Z}$ and let $\mathcal{I}$ be the ideal $\mathrm{Ker}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}^{\mathrm{ex}}} \to \mathcal{O}_Z)$. For $(a,b) \in \mathbf{A}$, let $B_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})$ be the formal blow-up of $\mathcal{Z}^{\mathrm{ex}}$ with respect to the ideal $\mathcal{I}^a + p^b\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}^{\mathrm{ex}}}$, let $T'_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})$ be the open sub formal scheme

$$\{x \in B_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}) \,|\, (\mathcal{I}^a + p^b\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}^{\mathrm{ex}}}) \cdot \mathcal{O}_{B_n(\mathcal{Z}),x} = p^b\mathcal{O}_{B_n(\mathcal{Z}),x}\}$$

and let $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})$ be $T'_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})_{\mathrm{fl}}$, where, for a p-adic formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme T, we denote by T_{fl} the closed subscheme of T defined by the ideal $\{x \in \mathcal{O}_T \,|\, \exists n, p^n x = 0\}$. Let $\lambda_{a,b} : T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ be the canonical morphism and put $Z_{a,b} := \lambda_n^{-1}(Z)$. Then the quadruple

$$T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}) := ((T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}), M_{\mathcal{Z}^{\mathrm{ex}}}|_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})}), (Z_{a,b}, M_Z|_{Z_{a,b}}), Z_{a,b} \hookrightarrow T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}), (Z_{a,b}, M_{Z_{a,b}}) \xrightarrow{\lambda_{a,b}} (Z, M_Z) \xrightarrow{z} (X, M))$$

is an enlargement for each $(a,b) \in \mathbf{A}$.

Lemma 1.16. *Let $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})$ be the enlargement defined above. Then:*

1. *We have $\lambda(T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})) \leq p^{-b/a}$.*
2. *The enlargements $\{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})\}_{(a,b)}$ forms an inductive system of enlargements indexed by $\mathbf{A}$.*
3. *Let us take $\lambda \in (0,1]$ and put $\lambda = p^{-r}$. For $T = \mathcal{Z}$ or $T = T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})$, denote the sheaf represented by T on $(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau}$ by h_T. Then we have $h_{\mathcal{Z}} = \varinjlim_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}_r} h_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})}$. (That is, $h_{\mathcal{Z}}$ is ind-represented by the system $\{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})\}$).*

Proof. (1) is obvious by definition. Let us prove (2). Take $(a,b) \in \mathbf{A}$. Then we have $\mathcal{I}^a \subseteq p^b\mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})}$. This implies the inclusions $\mathcal{I}^{a+1} \subseteq p^b\mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})}, \mathcal{I}^a \subseteq p^{b-1}\mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})}$ and $\mathcal{I}^{na} \subseteq p^{nb}\mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})}$ $(n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1})$. Then, by the universality of blow-up, we have the canonical mmorphisms

$$T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}) \longrightarrow T_{a+1,b}(\mathcal{Z}),\ \ T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}) \longrightarrow T_{a,b-1}(\mathcal{Z}),\ \ T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}) \longrightarrow T_{na,nb}(\mathcal{Z}),$$

that is, we have $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}) \longrightarrow T_{a',b'}(\mathcal{Z})$ for (a',b')'s with $(a,b) \succ\!\succ (a',b')$. By composition, we obtain the morphisms $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}) \longrightarrow T_{a',b'}(\mathcal{Z})$ for (a',b')'s with $(a,b) \succ (a',b')$. This morphism defines the structure of inductive system on $\{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})\}_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}}$ indexed by $\mathbf{A}$. (Transitivity follows again from the universality of blow-up.)

Let us prove (3). For an enlargement $\mathcal{Z}' := ((\mathcal{Z}', M_{\mathcal{Z}'}), (Z', M_{Z'}), i', z')$ with $\lambda(\mathcal{Z}) < \lambda$ with a morphism of quadruples $g : \mathcal{Z}' \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$, there exists $(a,b) \in \mathbf{A}_r$ such that $\mathrm{Ker}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}'} \to \mathcal{O}_{Z'})^a \subseteq p^b\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}'}$. Then, by the universality of blow-up, the morphism g factors uniquely as $\mathcal{Z}' \longrightarrow T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$. From this fact, we obtain the assertion (3). □

We have the following explicit description of $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})$ when $\mathcal{Z}^{\mathrm{ex}}$ is affine: If we put $A := \Gamma(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathrm{ex}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}^{\mathrm{ex}}})$, $I := \Gamma(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathrm{ex}}, \mathrm{Ker}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}^{\mathrm{ex}}} \to \mathcal{O}_Z))$ and write $I^a = (f_1, \cdots, f_k)$, we have $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}) = \mathrm{Spf}\, A_{a,b}$, where

$$A_{a,b} = (A[t_1, \cdots, t_k]/(p^b t_i - f_i\,(1 \leq i \leq k)))^{\wedge}/(p\text{-torsion}). \tag{1.1}$$

($^\wedge$ denotes the p-adic completion.) Then we have the following, as in [O2, 0.2.2]:

Lemma 1.17. *The image of the homomorphism* $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} A \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} A_{a,b}$ *is dense in* p*-adic topology.*

Proof. If we put $B := (A[t_1, \cdots, t_k]/(p^b t_i - f_i\,(1 \leq i \leq k)))/(p\text{-torsion})$, the above homomorphism factors as $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} A \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} B \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} A_{a,b}$ and the first homomorphism is an isomorphism. Moreover, we have $A_{a,b} = \widehat{B}$, where $\widehat{\ }$ denotes the p-adic completion. If x is an element in $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} A_{a,b}$, $p^n x$ is in $A_{a,b}$ for some n. Then, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists some $y \in B$ and $z \in A_{a,b}$ such that $p^n x = y + p^{m+n} z$ holds. Then we have $x = p^{-n} y + p^m z$ and $p^{-n} y \in \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} B = \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{Z} A$. So we are done. □

Corollary 1.18. *For a (pre-)widining* $\mathcal{Z}$ *and* $(a, b) \in \mathbf{A}$*, the map* $h_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})} \longrightarrow h_{\mathcal{Z}}$ *is injective.*

Proof. The proof is same as [O2, 0.2.2]. We may assume that $\mathcal{Z} = \operatorname{Spf} A, T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}) = \operatorname{Spf} A_{a,b}$ as above and it suffices to show that, for any enlargement $\mathcal{Z}'$ with $\mathcal{Z}' = \operatorname{Spf} B$ and any two homomorphisms $A_{a,b} \longrightarrow B$ with the same composition $A \longrightarrow A_{a,b} \longrightarrow B$ are equal. We can check it after applying $\mathbb{Q}\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}}$ (because B is flat over W), and in this case, the claim follows from the separatedness of B with respect to the p-adic topology and Lemma 1.17. □

We have the following lemmas as in [S3, 2.15, 2.16], [S2, 2.1.25, 2.1.26]. (Since we can prove them in the same way by using the explicit description (1.1), we omit the proof.)

Lemma 1.19. *Let* $\mathcal{Z}$ *be a pre-widening and let* $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}$ *be the associated widening. Then we have* $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}) \cong T_{a,b}(\widehat{\mathcal{Z}})$ *for any* $(a, b) \in \mathbf{A}$.

Lemma 1.20. *Let* $g : ((\mathcal{Z}', M_{\mathcal{Z}'}), (Z', M_{Z'}), i', z') \longrightarrow ((\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), (Z, M_Z), i, z)$ *be a morphism of (pre-)widenings such that* $(Z, M_Z) \times_{(\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}})} (\mathcal{Z}', M_{\mathcal{Z}'}) = (Z', M_{Z'})$ *holds naturally and that* $\mathcal{Z}' \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ *is flat. Then* g *induces the natural isomorphism of enlargements* $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}') \xrightarrow{=} T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}) \times_{\mathcal{Z}} \mathcal{Z}'$.

The following is a variant of [S2, 2.1.27], [S3, 2.17].

Proposition 1.21. *Let* $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ *be a morphism in* $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$*. Let*

$$f : \mathcal{Z}_1 := ((\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), (Z, M_Z), i, z) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}_2 := ((\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), (Z', M_{Z'}), i', z')$$

be a morphism of (pre-)widenings of $(\mathcal{X}, M_{\mathcal{X}})/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ *such that* f *is identity on* $\mathcal{Z}$ *and* $(Z, M_Z) \longrightarrow (Z', M_{Z'})$ *is an exact closed immersion. For* $(a, b) \in \mathbf{A}$*, denote the map of enlargements* $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}_1) \longrightarrow T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}_2)$ *induced by* f *by* $f_{(a,b)}$ *and for* $(a, b), (a', b') \in \mathbf{A}$ *with* $(a, b) \succ (a', b')$*, denote the transition morphism* $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}_i) \longrightarrow T_{a',b'}(\mathcal{Z}_i)$ *by* $g_{i,(a,b)(a',b')}$*. Let* $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}'$ *be the defining ideal of* Z, Z' *in* $\mathcal{Z}$ *respectively and assume that there exists an ideal sheaf* $\mathcal{J}$ *of* $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}$ *with* $\mathcal{J}^{m+1} = 0$ *satisfying* $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{I}' + \mathcal{J}$*. Then:*

1. *For any* $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbf{A}$ *with* $\alpha > m$*, there exists a morphism of* p*-adic fine log formal* $\mathcal{B}$*-schemes* $h_{(\alpha,\beta)} : T_{\alpha-m,\beta}(\mathcal{Z}_2) \longrightarrow T_{\alpha,\beta}(\mathcal{Z}_1)$*, satisfying the following condition: For any* $(a, b), (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbf{A}$ *with* $\alpha > m, (\alpha, \beta) \succ (a, b)$*, the composite*

$$T_{\alpha-m,\beta}(\mathcal{Z}_2) \xrightarrow{h_{(\alpha,\beta)}} T_{\alpha,\beta}(\mathcal{Z}_1) \xrightarrow{g_{1,(\alpha,\beta)(a,b)}} T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}_1) \xrightarrow{f_{(a,b)}} T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}_2)$$

is equal to $g_{2,(\alpha-m,\beta)(a,b)}$ *and for any* $(a,b),(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathbf{A}$ *with* $\alpha>m,(a,b)\succ(\alpha-m,\beta)$*, the composite*

$$T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}_1)\xrightarrow{f_{(a,b)}}T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}_2)\xrightarrow{g_{2,(a,b)(\alpha-m,\beta)}}T_{\alpha-m,\beta}(\mathcal{Z}_2)\xrightarrow{h_{(\alpha,\beta)}}T_{\alpha,\beta}(\mathcal{Z}_1)$$

is equal to $g_{1,(a,b)(\alpha,\beta)}$.

(2) *Let* $\lambda\in(0,1]$ *and put* $\lambda=p^{-r}$*. Then, for an isocrystal* $\mathcal{E}$ *on* $(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv},\tau}$ *and any* $(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathbf{A}_r$ *with* $\alpha>m$*, we have the natural isomorphism*

$$\varphi_{(\alpha,\beta)}:h^*_{(\alpha,\beta)}\mathcal{E}_{T_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_1)}\xrightarrow{\sim}\mathcal{E}_{T_{(\alpha-m,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}$$

which satisfies the following condition: For any $(a,b),(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathbf{A}_r$ *with* $\alpha>m$ *and* $(\alpha,\beta)\succ(a,b)$*, the composite*

$$\begin{aligned}(h_{(\alpha,\beta)}\circ g_{1,(\alpha,\beta)(a,b)}\circ f_{(a,b)})^*\mathcal{E}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}&\xrightarrow{h^*_{(\alpha,\beta)}\mathcal{E}(g_{1,(\alpha,\beta)(a,b)}\circ f_{(a,b)})}h^*_{(\alpha,\beta)}\mathcal{E}_{T_{\alpha,\beta}(\mathcal{Z}_1)}\\&\xrightarrow{\varphi_{(\alpha,\beta)}}\mathcal{E}_{T_{\alpha-m,\beta}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}\end{aligned}$$

is equal to the homomorphism induced by $g_{2,(\alpha-m,\beta)(a,b)}$ *and for any* $(a,b),(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathbf{A}_r$ *with* $\alpha>m$ *and* $(a,b)\succ(\alpha-m,\beta)$*, the composite*

$$\begin{aligned}(f_{(a,b)}\circ g_{2,(a,b)(\alpha-m,\beta)}\circ h_{(\alpha,\beta)})^*\mathcal{E}_{T_{\alpha,\beta}(\mathcal{Z}_1)}&\xrightarrow{(f_{(a,b)}\circ g_{2,(a,b)(\alpha-m,\beta)})^*\varphi_{\alpha,\beta}}(f_{(a,b)}\circ g_{2,(a,b)(\alpha-m,\beta)})^*\mathcal{E}_{T_{\alpha-m,\beta}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}\\&\xrightarrow{\mathcal{E}(f_{(a,b)}\circ g_{2,(a,b)(\alpha-m,\beta)})}\mathcal{E}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}_1)}\end{aligned}$$

is equal to the homomorphism induced by $g_{1,(a,b)(\alpha,\beta)}$.

Proof. We may replace $\mathcal{Z}$ by $\mathcal{Z}^{\text{ex}}$. So we may assume that $\mathcal{Z}_1,\mathcal{Z}_2$ are exact widenings.

For $(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathbf{A}$ with $\alpha>m$, we have $\mathcal{I}^\alpha\subseteq(\mathcal{I}'+\mathcal{J})^\alpha\subseteq\mathcal{I}'^{\alpha-m}$. So, since we have $\mathcal{I}'^{\alpha-m}\subseteq p^\beta\mathcal{O}_{T_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}$, we have $\mathcal{I}^\alpha\subseteq p^\beta\mathcal{O}_{T_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}$. So, by the universality of blow-up, we have the morphism $h_{(\alpha,\beta)}$.

Let us denote the pull-back of Z to $T_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_1)$ by $Z_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ and the pull-back of Z' to $T_{(\alpha-m,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_2)$ by $Z'_{(\alpha-m,\beta)}$. On the other hand, denote the pull-back of Z to $T_{(\alpha-m,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_2)$ by $Z_{(\alpha-m,\beta)}$. Then we have the diagram of enlargements

$$\begin{aligned}T_{(\alpha-m,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_2)=(T_{(\alpha-m,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_2),Z'_{(\alpha-m,\beta)})&\xleftarrow{j}(T_{(\alpha-m,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_2),Z_{(\alpha-m,\beta)})\\&\xrightarrow{h_{(\alpha,\beta)}}(T_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_1),Z_{(\alpha,\beta)})=:T_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_1),\end{aligned}$$

where j is the morphism of enlargements induced by the identity map on $T_{(\alpha-m,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_2)$. Moreover, we have $\lambda(T_{(\alpha-m,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_2))\leq p^{-\beta/(\alpha-m)}<\lambda,\lambda(T_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_1))\leq p^{-\beta/\alpha}<\lambda$ by definition and $\lambda((T_{(\alpha-m,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_2),Z_{(\alpha-m,\beta)}))\leq\lambda(T_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_1))<\lambda$ by Remark 1.6 (2). So we have the isomorphisms

$$h^*_{(\alpha,\beta)}E_{T_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_1)}\xrightarrow{\sim}E_{(T_{(\alpha-m,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_2),Z_{(\alpha-m,\beta)})}\xleftarrow{\sim}j^*E_{T_{(\alpha-m,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}=E_{T_{(\alpha-m,\beta)}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}.$$

We define the isomorphism $\varphi_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ by the morphism induced by the above diagram. Then it is easy to check that $h_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ and $\varphi_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ satisfy the desired properties. □

Now we introduce the site $\vec{\mathcal{Z}}_{r,\mathbf{a}}$, which is a generalization of the site $\vec{\mathcal{Z}}$ introduced in [O2], [S2], [S3]:

Definition 1.22. *Let $r > 0$, let $\mathbf{a}$ be a good sequence in $\mathbf{A}_r$ and let $\mathcal{Z}$ be a (pre-)widening. Then we define the site $\vec{\mathcal{Z}}_{r,\mathbf{a}}$ as follows: Objects are the open sets of $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})$ for some $(a,b) \in \mathbf{a}$. For open sets $U \subseteq T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})$ and $V \subseteq T_{a',b'}(\mathcal{Z})$ $((a,b),(a',b') \in \mathbf{a})$, $\mathrm{Hom}_{\vec{\mathcal{Z}}_{r,\mathbf{a}}}(U,V)$ is the set of morphisms $U \longrightarrow V$ commutes with the transition morphism $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}) \longrightarrow T_{a',b'}(\mathcal{Z})$ when $(a,b) \succ (a',b')$ holds and is empty otherwise. The coverings are defined by Zariski topology for each object. We define the strucrure sheaf $\mathcal{O}_{\vec{\mathcal{Z}}_{r,\mathbf{a}}}$ by $\mathcal{O}_{\vec{\mathcal{Z}}_{r,\mathbf{a}}}(U) := \Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_U)$.*

Definition 1.23. *A sheaf of $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_{\vec{\mathcal{Z}}_{r,\mathbf{a}}}$-module E is called crystalline if, for any transition map $\psi : T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}) \longrightarrow T_{a',b'}(\mathcal{Z})$, the transition map of sheaves $\psi^{-1}E_{a',b'} \longrightarrow E_{a,b}$ induces the isomorphism $\mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})} \otimes_{\psi^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_{T_{a',b'}(\mathcal{Z})})} \psi^{-1}E_{a',b'} \xrightarrow{\sim} E_{a,b}$, where $E_{a,b}$, $E_{a',b'}$ denotes the Zariski sheaf on $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}), T_{a',b'}(\mathcal{Z})$ induced by E.*

We define the morphism of ringed topoi $\gamma : \vec{\mathcal{Z}}^{\sim}_{r,\mathbf{a}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}^{\sim}_{\mathrm{Zar}}$ by $\gamma_* E := \varprojlim_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{a}} \alpha_{a,b*} E_{a,b}$ and $\gamma^*(E)|_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})} := \alpha^*_{a,b}E$. (Here $E_{a,b}$ is as above and $\alpha_{a,b}$ is the morphism $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$.) Then we have the following as in [O2, 0.3.7]:

Proposition 1.24. *Let $\mathcal{Z}$ be an affine widening, let $\mathbf{a}$ be a good sequence in $\mathbf{A}_r$ and let E be a crystalline sheaf of $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_{\vec{\mathcal{Z}}_{r,\mathbf{a}}}$-modules. Then we have $H^q(\vec{\mathcal{Z}}_{r,\mathbf{a}}, E) = 0$ for $q > 0$.*

Proof. Since the proof is similar to [O2, 0.3.7], we only give a sketch of the proof. Let us put $\mathcal{Z}^{\mathrm{ex}} = \mathrm{Spf}\, A$, $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}) = \mathrm{Spf}\, A_{a,b}$ $((a,b) \in \mathbf{a})$, $\mathbf{a} := \{(a_n,b_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and put $A_n := A_{a_n,b_n}, E_n := E_{a_n,b_n}$ for simplicity. Then, exactly in the same way as the proof of [O2, 0.3.7], we can reduce the proof of the proposition to the following claim:

claim. Let $\{F_n\}_n$ be a family of finitely generated $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} A_n$-modules endowed with transition maps $\psi_n : F_{n+1} \longrightarrow F_n$ such that each ψ_n induces the isomorphism $A_n \otimes_{A_{n+1}} F_{n+1} \xrightarrow{\simeq} F_n$. Then we have $R^q \varprojlim \{F_n\}_n = 0$ for $q > 0$.

We can prove this claim in the same way as [O2, 0.3.8]: It suffices to prove $R^1 \varprojlim \{F_n\}_n = 0$, and to show this, we may assume the existence of lattices $L_n \subseteq F_n$ $(n \in \mathbb{N})$ satisfying $\psi_n(L_{n+1}) \subseteq L_n$. Since the image of the map ψ_n is dense by Lemma 1.17, for any $(f_n)_n \in \prod_n F_n$, we have $(g_n)_n \in \prod_n F_n$ and $(f'_n)_n \in \prod p^n L_n$ such that $f_n + g_n = \psi(g_{n+1}) + f'_n$ holds for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $(f_n)_n$ is cohomologous to $(f'_n)_n$. Moreover, if we put $h_n := -\sum_{m=n}^{\infty} f'_m \in F_n$ (the infinite sum converges by definition of $(f'_n)_n$), we have $f'_n + h_n = \psi_n(h_{n+1})$. So $(f'_n)_n$ is cohomologous to 0. So we are done. □

We define the notion of the log tubular neighborhood of radius λ, as follows.

Definition 1.25. *Let $\lambda \in (0,1], \lambda = p^{-r}$ and let $(Z, M_Z) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}})$ be a closed immersion of a fine log $\mathcal{B}$-scheme to a fine log formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme. (Then we can regard $((\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), (Z, M_Z))$ as a widening on $(\mathcal{B}, M_{\mathcal{B}})/(\mathcal{B}, M_{\mathcal{B}})$.) Then we define the log tubular neighborhood $]Z[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Z},\lambda}$ of radius λ of (Z, M_Z) in $(\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}})$ as the rigid analytic space $\bigcup_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}_r} T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})_K$. We define the specialization map $\mathrm{sp} :]Z[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Z},\lambda} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$*

as the union of composites $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})_K \longrightarrow T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$*, where the first map is the specialization map for* $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})$.

Next, we show the relation between the category of isocrystals and certain categories of stratifications and give the definition of the log de Rham complex on tubular neighborhood associated to an isocrystal. (This is also a 'λ-version' of what was shown in [S3, 2.21, 2.22].) Let us consider the situation

$$\begin{tikzcd}(X, M_X) \arrow[r, "i"] \arrow[d, "f"'] & (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}) \arrow[d, "g"] \\ (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}) \arrow[r, equal] & (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}),\end{tikzcd} \tag{1.2}$$

where (X, M_X) is an object in $(\mathrm{LS}/\mathcal{B})$, f is a morphism in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$, i is a closed immersion in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ and g is a formally log smooth morphism in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(\mathcal{P}(n), M_{\mathcal{P}(n)})$ be the $(n+1)$-fold fiber product of $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$, let $i(n) : (X, M_X) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}(n), M_{\mathcal{P}(n)})$ be the closed immersion induced by i and denote the pre-widening $((\mathcal{P}(n), M_{\mathcal{P}(n)}), (X, M_X), i(n), \mathrm{id})$ of $(X, M_X)/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ simply by $\mathcal{P}(n)$. Then we have the system $\{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}(n))\}_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}}$, the projections

$$p_{i,(a,b)} : T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}(1)) \longrightarrow T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}) \quad (i = 1, 2),$$

$$p_{ij,(a,b)} : T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}(2)) \longrightarrow T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}(1)) \quad (1 \leq i < j \leq 3)$$

and the diagonal map $\Delta_{(a,b)} : T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}) \longrightarrow T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}(1))$. For $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ with $\lambda = p^{-r}$, let $\mathrm{Str}'_{\lambda}((X \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$ be the category of compatible family of isocoherent sheaves $E_{a,b}$ on $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})$ $((a, b) \in \mathbf{A}_r)$ endowed with compatible isomorphisms $\epsilon_{a,b} : p^*_{2,(a,b)}E_{a,b} \xrightarrow{\sim} p^*_{1,(a,b)}E_{a,b}$ satisfying $\Delta^*_{(a,b)}(\epsilon_{a,b}) = \mathrm{id}$, $p^*_{12,(a,b)}(\epsilon_{a,b}) \circ p^*_{23,(a,b)}(\epsilon_{a,b}) = p^*_{13,(a,b)}(\epsilon_{a,b})$.

On the other hand, from the closed immersion $i(n)$, we can form the tubular neighbouhood $]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}(n),\lambda}$ and we have the projections

$$p_i :]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}(1),\lambda} \longrightarrow]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda} \quad (i = 1, 2), \qquad p_{ij} :]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}(2),\lambda} \longrightarrow]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}(1),\lambda} \quad (1 \leq i < j \leq 3)$$

and the diagonal map $\Delta :]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda} \longrightarrow]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}(1),\lambda}$. Let $\mathrm{Str}''_{\lambda}((X \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$ be the category of pairs (E, ϵ), where E is a coherent $\mathcal{O}_{]\mathcal{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}}$-module and ϵ is an $\mathcal{O}_{]\mathcal{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}(1),\lambda}}$-linear isomorphism $p_2^*E \xrightarrow{\sim} p_1^*E$ satisfying $\Delta^*(\epsilon) = \mathrm{id}$, $p^*_{12}(\epsilon) \circ p^*_{23}(\epsilon) = p^*_{13}(\epsilon)$. Then we have the following proposition:

Proposition 1.26. *With the above notation, we have the functorial equivalence of categories*

$$I_{\mathrm{conv}}(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \simeq \mathrm{Str}'((\mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \simeq \mathrm{Str}''((\mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}).$$

Proof. We can prove the proposition in the same way as [S2, 2.2.7], once we note the following fact: If we have an enlargement $\mathcal{Z} := ((\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), (Z, M_Z), j, z)$ with

$\lambda(\mathcal{Z}) < \lambda = p^{-r}$ which fits into the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(Z, M_Z) \arrow[r, "j"] \arrow[d, "z"'] & (\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}) \arrow[d] \\
(X, M_X) \arrow[r, "i"] & (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}),
\end{tikzcd}$$

there exists $(a,b) \in \mathbf{A}_r$ such that the map $(\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ factors through $(T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}), M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})})$. □

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be an isocrystal on $(X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv}}$ and let (E, ϵ) be the associated object in $\mathrm{Str}''_{\lambda}((X \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$. If we denote the first log infinitesimal neighborhood of $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ into $(\mathcal{P}(1), M_{\mathcal{P}(1)})$ by $(\mathcal{P}^1, M_{\mathcal{P}^1})$, then ϵ induces the $\mathcal{O}_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^1,\lambda}}$-linear isomorphism

$$\epsilon_1 : \mathcal{O}_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^1,\lambda}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}}} E \longrightarrow E \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}}} \mathcal{O}_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^1,\lambda}}$$

and it induces the log connection

$$\nabla : E \longrightarrow E \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}}} \omega^1_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}/\mathcal{Y}_K}$$

by $\nabla(e) := \epsilon_1(1 \otimes e) - e \otimes 1$. Then we have the following lemma (cf.[S3, 2.22]).

Lemma 1.27. *The log connection* ∇ *above is integrable.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of [S3, 2.22]: When there exists a chart of the log scheme $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$, we can prove the lemma in the same way as [S2, 1.2.7, 1.2.8]. So it suffices to prove that we may work etale locally on $\mathcal{P}$.

Let $\{(E_{a,b}, \epsilon_{a,b})\}_m$ be the object in $\mathrm{Str}'_{\lambda}((X \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$ associated to $\mathcal{E}$, let $(T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})^{n\prime}, M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})^{n\prime}})$ be the n-th log infinitesimal neighborhood of $(T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}), M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})})$ in $(T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}), M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})} (T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}), M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})})$ and let $(T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})^n, M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})^n}) \hookrightarrow (T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})^{n\prime}, M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})^{n\prime}})$ be the exact closed immersion defined by the ideal $\{x \in \mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})^{n\prime}} \mid \exists m,\, p^m x = 0\}$. (Then, if we denote $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}) := ((T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}), M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})}), (X_{a,b}, M_{X_{a,b}}))$ as enlargement, $((T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})^n, M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})^n}), (X_{a,b}, M_{X_{a,b}}))$ is regarded also as an enlargement, which we denote by $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})^n$.) Let us consider the morphism of pre-widenings

$$T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})^n \longrightarrow T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}) \times T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(1). \tag{1.3}$$

If we put $\mathcal{I} := \mathrm{Ker}(\mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})^n} \to \mathcal{O}_{X_{a,b}})$ and $\mathcal{J} := \mathrm{Ker}(\mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})^n} \to \mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})})$, we have $\mathcal{J}^{n+1} = 0, (\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{J})^a \subseteq p^b(\mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})^n}/\mathcal{J})$. Hence, for any $N \geq n$, we have

$$\mathcal{I}^{Na} \subseteq (p^b \mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})^n} + \mathcal{J})^N \subseteq p^{b(N-n)} \mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})^n} + \mathcal{J}^{n+1} = p^{b(N-n)} \mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})^n}.$$

So, by the universality of blow-up, the morphism $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})^n \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(1)$ in (1.3) factors through $T_{Na,(N-n)b}(\mathcal{P})$. If we take N sufficiently large, we have $(N-n)b/(Na) > r$. So, by pulling back the isomorphism $\epsilon_{Na,(N-n)b}$, we obtain the isomorphism

$$\epsilon'_{a,b,n} : \mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})^n} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})}} E_{a,b} \xrightarrow{\sim} E_{a,b} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})}} \mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})^n}$$

and $\epsilon'_{a,b,1}$ induces the connection

$$\nabla_{a,b} : E_{a,b} \longrightarrow E_{a,b} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})}} \omega^1_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})/\mathcal{Y}}.$$

Then it is easy to see that the compatible family $\{(E_{a,b}, \nabla_{a,b})\}$ induces (E, ∇) via the equivalence

$$\begin{pmatrix}\text{compatible family of} \\ \text{isocoherent sheaves on} \\ \{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})\}_{(a,b)\in \mathbf{A}_r}\end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{\sim} \begin{pmatrix}\text{coherent} \\ \mathcal{O}_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}}\text{-module}\end{pmatrix}.$$

So it suffices to prove the integrability of $(E_{a,b}, \nabla_{a,b})$ to prove the lemma and we may work etale locally on $\mathcal{P}$ to check it. So we are done. □

By the above lemma, we can define the log de Rham complex

$$\mathrm{DR}(]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}) := [0 \longrightarrow E \xrightarrow{\nabla} E \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}}} \omega^1_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}/\mathcal{Y}_K} \xrightarrow{\nabla} \cdots \xrightarrow{\nabla} E \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}}} \omega^q_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}/\mathcal{Y}_K} \xrightarrow{\nabla} \cdots]$$

on $]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}/\mathcal{Y}_K$ associated to the isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ in standard way.

Next we give a proof of the log convergent Poincaré lemma for relative log convergent cohomology of radius λ.

Let $\lambda \in (0,1], \lambda = p^{-r}$ and take a good sequence $\mathbf{a}$ in $\mathbf{A}_r$. Let (X, M_X) be an object in (LS/$\mathcal{B}$), let $(X, M_X) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ be a morphism in (pLFS/$\mathcal{B}$) and let $\mathcal{Z}$ be a widening on $(X, M_X)/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$. Then we have morphisms of topoi

$$u : (X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log,\sim}_{\lambda\text{-conv,Zar}} \longrightarrow X^{\sim}_{\mathrm{Zar}}, \quad j_{\mathcal{Z}} : (X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log,\sim}_{\lambda\text{-conv,Zar}}|_{\mathcal{Z}} \longrightarrow (X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log,\sim}_{\lambda\text{-conv,Zar}}$$

as in [S2, pp.90–91], [S3, §2]. Also, we have a morphism of ringed topoi

$$\phi_{\mathcal{Z}} : (X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log,\sim}_{\mathrm{conv,Zar}}|_{\mathcal{Z}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}^{\sim}_{\mathrm{Zar}}$$

defined by $(\phi_{\mathcal{Z},*}E)(U) := \varprojlim_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}_r} E(T_{a,b}(U)) = \varprojlim_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{a}} E(T_{a,b}(U)), \phi^*_{\mathcal{Z}}E(g : T \to \mathcal{Z}) := g^*E(T)$, and a functor

$$\phi_{\vec{\mathcal{Z}}_{r,\mathbf{a}},*} : (\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log,\sim}_{\lambda\text{-conv,Zar}}|_{\mathcal{Z}} \longrightarrow \vec{\mathcal{Z}}^{\sim}_{r,\mathbf{a}}$$

defined by $\phi_{\vec{\mathcal{Z}}_{r,\mathbf{a}},*}E(U) := E(U \overset{\subset}{\to} T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}) \to \mathcal{Z})$. Then, by the same agrument as in [S3, 2.28] and [S2, 2.3.4], we have the following (we omit the proof):

Proposition 1.28. *Let $\mathcal{Z}$ be an affine widening and $\mathcal{E}$ an isocrystal on $(X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log,\sim}_{\lambda\text{-conv}}|_{\mathcal{Z}}$. Then $j_{\mathcal{Z},*}\mathcal{E}$ is u_*-acyclic.*

Remark 1.29. In the course of the proof of Proposition 1.28, we use Proposition 1.24.

Now let us consider the situation

(1.4)
$$\begin{tikzcd} (X, M_X) \arrow[r, "i"] \arrow[d, "f"'] & (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}) \arrow[d, "g"'] \\ (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}) \arrow[r, equal] & (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}), \end{tikzcd}$$

where (X, M_X) is an object in (LS/$\mathcal{B}$), f is a morphism in (pLFS/$\mathcal{B}$), i is a closed immersion in (pLFS/$\mathcal{B}$) and g is a formally log smooth morphism in (pLFS/$\mathcal{B}$).

Then $\mathcal{P} := ((\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}), (X, M_X), i, \mathrm{id})$ is a pre-widening of $(X, M_X)/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$. Denote the associated widening of $\mathcal{P}$ by $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ and, for an isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ on $(X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv}}$, put

$$\omega^i_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\mathcal{E}) := j_{\hat{\mathcal{P}},*}(j^*_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}\mathcal{E} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X/\mathcal{Y}}} \phi^*_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\omega^i_{\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Y}}|_{\hat{P}})).$$

Then we have the following theorem ('radius λ version' of [S3, 2.29]):

Theorem 1.30. *Let the notations be as above. Then there exists a canonical structure of complex on* $\omega^\bullet_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\mathcal{E})$ *and the adjoint homomorphism* $\mathcal{E} \longrightarrow j_{\hat{\mathcal{P}},*}j^*_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}\mathcal{E} = \omega^0_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\mathcal{E})$ *induces the quasi-isomorphism* $\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \omega^\bullet_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\mathcal{E})$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of [S3, 2.29]. First, one can check that, for an enlargement $\mathcal{Z}$ with $\lambda(\mathcal{Z}) < \lambda$, the sheaf $\omega^i_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\mathcal{E})_{\mathcal{Z}}$ on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{Zar}}$ induced by $\omega^i_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}$ is given by

$$\omega^i_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\mathcal{E})_{\mathcal{Z}} = \varprojlim{}_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}_r} \pi_{\mathcal{Z},a,b,*}(\mathcal{E}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}\times\mathcal{P})} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}\times\mathcal{P})}} \pi^*_{\mathcal{P},a,b}\omega^i_{\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Y}}),$$

where $r := -\log_p \lambda$, $\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{P}$ is the product of $\mathcal{Z}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ taken in the category of pre-widenings, $\pi_{\mathcal{P},a,b}$ is the canonical map $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{P}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{Z},a,b}$ is the canonical map $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{P}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$. To define a canonical structure of a complex on $\omega^\bullet_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\mathcal{E})$, it suffices to construct a canonical, functorial structure of a complex on $\omega^\bullet_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\mathcal{E})_{\mathcal{Z}}$ for affine enlargements $\mathcal{Z} := ((\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), (Z, M_Z), i, z)$ with $\lambda(\mathcal{Z}) < \lambda$. Let $(\mathcal{P}^m, M_{\mathcal{P}^m})$ be the m-th log infinitesimal neighborhood of $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ in $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y},M_{\mathcal{Y}})} (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$, let $p_{i,m} : (\mathcal{P}^m, M_{\mathcal{P}^m}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})\,(i = 1, 2)$ be the morphism induced by the i-th projection and put $X^m_i := p^{-1}_{i,m}(X)$, $M_{X^m_i} := M_X|_{X^m_i}$. Then we have pre-widenings

$$\mathcal{P}^m := ((\mathcal{P}^m, M_{\mathcal{P}^m}), (X, M_X)), \quad \mathcal{P}^m_i := ((\mathcal{P}^m, M_{\mathcal{P}^m}), (X^m_i, M_{X^m_i})),$$

and the following diagram of pre-widenings (for $i = 1, 2$):

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{P}^m \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{P}^m_i \arrow[d, "p_{i,m}"'] \\
\mathcal{P} \arrow[r, equal] & \mathcal{P}.
\end{tikzcd}$$

It induces the diagram of pre-widenings

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{P}^m \times \mathcal{Z} \arrow[r, "r_i"] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{P}^m_i \times \mathcal{Z} \arrow[d, "q_i"'] \\
\mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{Z} \arrow[r, equal] & \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{Z}
\end{tikzcd} \tag{1.5}$$

for $i = 1, 2$. Now let us consider the following diagram $(i = 1, 2)$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y},M_{\mathcal{Y}})} (\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}) \arrow[r, "\Delta"] & (\mathcal{P}^m, M_{\mathcal{P}^m}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y},M_{\mathcal{Y}})} (\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}) \arrow[r, "q_i"] & (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y},M_{\mathcal{Y}})} (\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}) \\
(Z, M_Z) \arrow[u] \arrow[r, "\Delta'"] & (X^m_i, M_{X^m_i}) \times_{(X,M_X)} (Z, M_Z) \arrow[u] \arrow[r, "q'_i"] & (Z, M_Z), \arrow[u]
\end{tikzcd}$$

where q_i, q'_i are the morphism induced by the morphism of pre-widenings q_i in (1.5) and Δ, Δ' are the morphisms induced by the diagonal $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{P}^m, M_{\mathcal{P}^m})$. Then it is easy to see that the right square and the large rectangle are Cartesian.

Hence the left square is also Cartesian. Hence, by Proposition 1.21, $r_i\,(i = 1, 2)$ induce the isomorphisms of inductive systems

$$\{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}^m \times \mathcal{Z})\}_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}_r} \cong \{T_n(\mathcal{P}^m_i \times \mathcal{Z})\}_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}_r}. \tag{1.6}$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 1.20, we see that $q_i\,(i = 1, 2)$ induce the isomorphisms

(1.7)

$$T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}^m_1 \times \mathcal{Z}) \cong T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{Z}) \times_{\mathcal{P}} \mathcal{P}^m, \quad T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}^m_2 \times \mathcal{Z}) \cong \mathcal{P}^m \times_{\mathcal{P}} T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{Z}).$$

By evaluating $\mathcal{E}$ on $\{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{Z})\}_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}_r}$, we see that $\mathcal{E}$ naturally induces a coherent sheaf E on $]Z[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^m\times\mathcal{Z},\lambda}= \bigcup_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}_r} T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{Z})_K$, and the isomorphisms (1.6), (1.7) induce the isomorphisms

$$\theta_m : \pi^*_{\mathcal{P}}\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}^m} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{]Z[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}\times\mathcal{Z},\lambda}}} E \xrightarrow{\simeq} E \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{]Z[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}\times\mathcal{Z},\lambda}}} \pi^*_{\mathcal{P}}\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}^m} \quad (m \in \mathbb{N}).$$

(Here $\pi^*_{\mathcal{P}}$ denotes the functor $\mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{O}_{]Z[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}\times\mathcal{Z},\lambda}})$ defined as composite

$$\mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Coh}(\mathbb{Q} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}}) \simeq \mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_K}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{O}_{]Z[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}\times\mathcal{Z},\lambda}}),$$

where the last arrow is the functor induced by the map $]Z[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}\times\mathcal{Z},\lambda}\longrightarrow \mathcal{P}_K$.) Then we can define the map $\widetilde{d} : E \longrightarrow E \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{]Z[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}\times\mathcal{Z},\lambda}}} \pi^*_{\mathcal{P}}\omega^1_{\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Y}}$ by $\widetilde{d}(e) := \theta_1(1 \otimes e) - e \otimes 1$, and extend it to the diagram

$$E \xrightarrow{\widetilde{d}} E \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{]Z[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}\times\mathcal{Z},\lambda}}} \pi^*_{\mathcal{P}}\omega^1_{\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Y}} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{d}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\widetilde{d}} E \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{]Z[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}\times\mathcal{Z},\lambda}}} \pi^*_{\mathcal{P}}\omega^q_{\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Y}} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{d}} \cdots$$

in standard way. By applying the direct image by the map $\pi_{\mathcal{Z}} :]Z[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}\times\mathcal{Z},\lambda}\longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}_K \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ to the above diagram, we obtain the diagram

$$\omega^\bullet_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\mathcal{E})_{\mathcal{Z}} := [\omega^0_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\mathcal{E})_{\mathcal{Z}} \xrightarrow{d} \omega^1_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\mathcal{E})_{\mathcal{Z}} \xrightarrow{d} \cdots \xrightarrow{d} \omega^q_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\mathcal{E})_{\mathcal{Z}} \xrightarrow{d} \cdots],$$

since we have

$$\pi_{\mathcal{Z},*}(E \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{]Z[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}\times\mathcal{Z},\lambda}}} \pi^*_{\mathcal{P}}\omega^q_{\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Y}}) = \varprojlim{}_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}_r} \pi_{\mathcal{Z},a,b,*}(\mathcal{E}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}\times\mathcal{P})} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}\times\mathcal{P})}} \pi^*_{\mathcal{P},a,b}\omega^q_{\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Y}})$$

by definition. This construction is functorial with respect to affine enlargement $\mathcal{Z}$ and so it induces the diagram

$$\omega^\bullet_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\mathcal{E}) := [\omega^0_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\mathcal{E}) \xrightarrow{d} \omega^1_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\mathcal{E}) \xrightarrow{d} \cdots \xrightarrow{d} \omega^q_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\mathcal{E}) \xrightarrow{d} \cdots].$$

We should prove that the diagram $\omega^\bullet_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\mathcal{E})$ forms a complex and that the adjoint map $\mathcal{E} \longrightarrow j_{\hat{\mathcal{P}},*}j^*_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}\mathcal{E} = \omega^0_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\mathcal{E})$ induces the quasi-isomorphism $\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\sim} \omega^\bullet_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\mathcal{E})$. We can prove this in the same way as [S3, 2.29], once we establish Lemmas 1.31, 1.32 below. So we are done. □

We give (a sketch of) the proof of the following two lemmas which is used in the above proof (cf. [S3, 2.31, 2.32]):

Lemma 1.31. *Let (X, M_X) be a fine log $\mathcal{B}$-scheme and assume we are given the commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(X, M_X) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}) \arrow[d, "f"'] \\
(X, M_X) \arrow[r] & (\mathcal{Q}, M_{\mathcal{Q}}),
\end{tikzcd} \tag{1.8}$$

where $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}), (\mathcal{Q}, M_{\mathcal{Q}})$ are p-adic fine log formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme, horizontal arrows are closed immersions and f is formally log smooth. Then, Zariski locally on $\mathcal{Q}$, we have the isomorphism $]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda} \cong]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Q},\lambda} \times D^r_\lambda$ for some r (where D_λ denotes the open disc of radius λ) such that the morphism $]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda} \longrightarrow]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Q},\lambda}$ induced by f is identified with the first projection $]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Q},\lambda} \times D^r_\lambda \longrightarrow]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Q},\lambda}$ via this isomorphism.

Proof. By localizing enough, we have $\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{ex}} =: \mathrm{Spf}\, A, \mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}} =: \mathrm{Spf}\, B$ with $B \cong A[[x_1, \cdots, x_r]]$, by [S3, 2.31]. Then one can see easily that $]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda} =]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Q},\lambda} \times D^r_\lambda$ holds. □

Lemma 1.32. *Let $\mathcal{Z} := \mathrm{Spf}\, A_0$ be a p-adic affine formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme and $\pi : \mathcal{Z}_K \times D^r_\lambda \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}_K$ be the projection. (Here D^r_λ is as in the previous lemma.) Then the complex*

$$\mathrm{sp}_* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_K} \longrightarrow (\mathrm{sp} \circ \pi)_* \Omega^\bullet_{\mathcal{Z}_K \times D^r_\lambda / \mathcal{Z}_K} \tag{1.9}$$

is homotopic to zero.

Proof. The proof is the same as [S3, 2.32]. The crucial point is that, for $f(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_r) \in \Gamma(\mathcal{Z}_K \times D^r_\lambda, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_K \times D^r_\lambda})$, the integral $\int_0^{x_j} f(x_1, \cdots, \underset{\hat{j}}{t}, \cdots x_r) dt$ is again contained in $\Gamma(\mathcal{Z}_K \times D^r_\lambda, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_K \times D^r_\lambda})$. □

Let $\tilde{u} : (X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log,\sim}_{\lambda\text{-conv,et}} \longrightarrow X^{\sim}_{\mathrm{Zar}}$ be the composite $(X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log,\sim}_{\lambda\text{-conv,et}} \xrightarrow{\epsilon} (X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log,\sim}_{\lambda\text{-conv,Zar}} \xrightarrow{u} X^{\sim}_{\mathrm{Zar}}$. Then we can prove the following propositions in the same way as [S2, 2.3.8], [S3, 2.33]:

Corollary 1.33. *Assume that the diagram (1.4) is given and let $\mathcal{E}$ be an isocrystal on $(X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv,et}}$. Then we have the canonical quasi-isomorphism*

$$R\tilde{u}_* \mathcal{E} = \mathrm{sp}_* \mathrm{DR}(]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda} / \mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}).$$

Proof. We may assume that $((\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}), (X, M_X), i, \mathrm{id})$ is an affine widening. By Theorem 1.30, we have the quasi-isomorphism

$$R\tilde{u}_* \mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\sim} Ru_* \omega^\bullet_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\epsilon_* \mathcal{E}).$$

Next, by Proposition 1.28, we have the quasi-isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned}
Ru_* \omega^\bullet_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\epsilon_* \mathcal{E}) &= Ru_* j_{\hat{\mathcal{P}},*}(\phi^*_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\omega^\bullet_{\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Y}}|_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}) \otimes j^*_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} \epsilon_* \mathcal{E}) \\
&= u_* j_{\hat{\mathcal{P}},*}(\phi^*_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\omega^\bullet_{\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Y}}|_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}) \otimes j^*_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} \epsilon_* \mathcal{E}) = u_* \omega^\bullet_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\epsilon_* \mathcal{E}).
\end{aligned}$$

So, it suffices to prove the isomorphism

$$\tilde{u}_* \omega^\bullet_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\epsilon_* \mathcal{E}) \cong \mathrm{sp}_* \mathrm{DR}(]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda} / \mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}). \tag{1.10}$$

We can check that the each component of both hand sides in (1.10) are equal, as in [S2, p.106 line (−5) – p.107 line 7]. So it suffices to prove that the differentials are compatible. Let $\mathcal{P}^1, \mathcal{P}^1_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$ are as in the proof of Theorem 1.30 and let us consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}^1} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}}} \mathcal{E}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{E}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}^1)} \arrow[d, equal] & \mathcal{E}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}^1} \arrow[l] \arrow[d] \\
\mathcal{E}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}^1_2)} \arrow[r] & \mathcal{E}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}^1)} & \mathcal{E}_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}^1_1)}. \arrow[l]
\end{tikzcd}$$

Note that the vertical arrows are isomorphisms, and the lower horizontal arrows become isomorphic after we take the inverse limit on $(a, b) \in \mathbf{A}_r$. So all the morphisms are isomorphic after we take the inverse limit on $(a, b) \in \mathbf{A}_r$. The differential on $\mathrm{sp}_*\mathrm{DR}(]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E})$ is, by definition, induced by $\varprojlim_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}_r}$ of the upper horizontal arrows. On the other hand, $\varprojlim_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}_r}$ of the lower horizontal arrows is compatible with the isomorphism $\pi_{\mathcal{Z},*}\theta_1$ (where $\pi_{\mathcal{Z}}, \theta_1$ are as in the proof of Theorem 1.30), which induces the differential on $\omega^{\bullet}_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\epsilon_*\mathcal{E})_{\mathcal{Z}}$ (for any affine enlargement $\mathcal{Z}$ with $\lambda(\mathcal{Z}) < \lambda$). So the differential on $\mathrm{sp}_*\mathrm{DR}(]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E})$ is compatible with the differential on $\widetilde{u}_*\omega^{\bullet}_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}(\epsilon_*\mathcal{E})$. So we are done. □

We can prove the following corollary in the same way as [S2, 2.3.9],[S3, 2.34] (we omit the proof).

Corollary 1.34. *Let (X, M_X) be an object in the category* (LS/$\mathcal{B}$)*, let $f : (X, M_X) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ be a morphism in* (pLFS/$\mathcal{B}$) *and let $\mathcal{E}$ be an isocrystal on $(X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv}}$. If we take an embedding system*

$$(X, M_X) \xleftarrow{g} (X^{(\bullet)}, M_{X^{(\bullet)}}) \xhookrightarrow{i} (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}),$$

we have the isomorphism

$$R^n f_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E} \cong R^n(f \circ g)_*\mathrm{sp}_*\mathrm{DR}(]X^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)},\lambda}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}).$$

Now we would like to compare relative log convergent cohomology of radius λ and relative log crystalline cohomology. Assume we are given the diagram

$$(X, M_X) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, M_Y) \xhookrightarrow{\iota} (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}), \tag{1.11}$$

where f is a log smooth morphism in (LS/B), $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ is an object in (pLFS/$\mathcal{B}$) and ι is the exact closed immersion defined by $p\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}$. Denote the canonical PD-structure on $p\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ by γ.

First we construct a functor from the category of isocrystals on log convergent site of radius λ to that on log crystalline site when λ is close to 1:

Proposition 1.35. *With the above notation, let $d := \max_{x\in X} \mathrm{rk}\,(\omega^1_{X/Y})$ and $\lambda_0 := p^{-1/(26d(p-1)+1)}$. Then, for $\lambda \in (\lambda_0, 1]$, we have the canonical functor*

$$\Phi : I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \longrightarrow I_{\mathrm{crys}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$$

such that Φ sends locally free isocrystals on $(X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv}}$ to locally free isocrystals on $(X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\mathrm{crys}}$.

Proof. The proof is similar to [S3, 2.35], but it is a little more complicated. First, let us consider the situation that (X, M_X) admits a closed immersion $(X, M_X) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ into a p-adic fine log formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme which is formally log smooth over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$. Denote the $(i+1)$-fold fiber product of $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ by $(\mathcal{P}(i), M_{\mathcal{P}(i)})$ and let $(\mathcal{P}(i)^{\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{P}(i)^{\mathrm{ex}}})$ be the exactification of the closed immersion $(X, M_X) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}(i), M_{\mathcal{P}(i)})$. Let $\mathcal{I}(i) := \mathrm{Ker}(\mathcal{O}^{\mathrm{ex}}_{\mathcal{P}(i)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X)$, let $B_{a,b}(i)$ be the formal blow-up of $\mathcal{P}(i)^{\mathrm{ex}}$ with respect to the ideal $\mathcal{I}(i)^a + p^b\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}}$, let $T'_{a,b}(i)$ be the open sub formal scheme of $B_{a,b}(i)$ defined as the set of points $x \in B_{a,b}(i)$ satisfying $(\mathcal{I}(i)^a + p^b\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}(i)})\mathcal{O}_{B_{a,b}(i),x} = p^b\mathcal{O}_{B_{a,b}(i),x}$ and let $T_{a,b}(i)$ be the closed sub formal scheme of $T_{a,b}(i)$ defined by the ideal $\{x \in \mathcal{O}_{T_{a,b}(i)} \,|\, p^n x = 0 \,\text{for some}\; n > 0\}$. On the other hand, let $D(i)$ be the p-adically completed log PD-envelope of (X, M_X) in $(\mathcal{P}(i), M_{\mathcal{P}(i)})$. Let $m = m(X, \mathcal{P})$ be the minimal integer such that, for $i = 0, 1, 2$, $\mathrm{Ker}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}(i)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X)$ is generated locally by p and some other m elements. Then there exist canonical diagrams $D(i) \longrightarrow T'_{n,1}(i) \hookleftarrow T_{n,1}(i)$ for $n = (p-1)m + 1$ and $i = 0, 1, 2$, where the second map is the canonical closed immersion. Since we have the canonical equivalences of categories $\mathrm{Coh}(\mathbb{Q} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{T_{n,1}(i)}) \cong \mathrm{Coh}(\mathbb{Q} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{T'_{n,1}(i)})$, we can define, by the 'pull-back by $D(i) \longrightarrow T'_{n,1}(i)$', the functor

$$I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Str}''((X \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{HPDI}((X \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$$

if we have $\lambda > p^{-1/n} = p^{-1/((p-1)m(X,\mathcal{P})+1)}$. (Here $\mathrm{HPDI}((X \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$ is the category of HPD-isostratifications defined in [S3, 1.17].)

Next, let us consider the general situation and take an embedding system

$$(X, M_X) \xleftarrow{g^{(\bullet)}} (X^{(\bullet)}, M_{X^{(\bullet)}}) \xhookrightarrow{i} (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}) \tag{1.12}$$

over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ such that g is a Zariski Čech hypercovering and that $(\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}) = \mathrm{cosk}_0^{(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})}(\mathcal{P}^{(0)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(0)}})$ holds. Let $\Delta_{\lambda\text{-conv}}$ be the category of descent data on $I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X^{(n)}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})\,(n = 0, 1, 2)$ (that is, the category of objects in $I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X^{(0)}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$ endowed with isomorphism of glueing in $I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X^{(1)}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$ satisfying the cocycle condition in $I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}(X^{(2)}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$). Similarly, let Δ_{crys} be the category of descent data on $I_{\mathrm{crys}}((X^{(n)}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})\,(n = 0, 1, 2)$ and let Δ_{HPDI} be the category of descent data on $\mathrm{HPDI}((X^{(n)} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}^{(n)}/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})\,(n = 0, 1, 2)$. Let $m(X^{(\bullet)}, \mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)})$ be the integer $\max_{0 \leq i \leq 2} m(X^{(i)}, \mathcal{P}^{(i)})$. Then, for $\lambda \in (p^{-1/((p-1)m(X^{(\bullet)}, \mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)})+1)}, 1]$, we have the diagram

$$\Delta_{\lambda\text{-conv}} \xrightarrow{\Phi} \Delta_{\mathrm{HPDI}} \xleftarrow{\Lambda} \Delta_{\mathrm{crys}},$$

where Λ is the functor from the category of isocrystals on log crystalline site to the category of HPD-isostratifications defined in [S3, §1].

We know that the functor Λ is fully faithful, and that, if we have

$$(\mathcal{P}^{(0)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(0)}}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})} (Y, M_Y) = (X^{(0)}, M_{X^{(0)}}), \tag{1.13}$$

the functor Λ is an equivalence of categories. (Note that it is possible to take an embedding system (1.12) satisfying the condition (1.13).) So, under the condition (1.13), we have the functor

$$\Phi : I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \Delta_{\mathrm{conv}} \xrightarrow{\Psi} \Delta_{\mathrm{HPDI}} \xrightarrow{\Lambda^{-1}} \Delta_{\mathrm{crys}} \xrightarrow{\sim} I_{\mathrm{crys}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$$

for $\lambda \in (p^{-1/((p-1)m(X^{(\bullet)},\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)})+1)}, 1]$. Moreover, under the condition (1.13), we can give a bound for $m(X^{(\bullet)},\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)})$: Under (1.13), $m(X^{(i)},\mathcal{P}^{(i)})\,(i=0,1,2)$ is the minimal number of (local) generators of the closed immersion

$$X^{(i)} \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}^{(i)}(2), M_{\mathcal{P}^{(i)}(2)})^{\mathrm{ex}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{F}_p = ((X^{(0)}, M_{X^{(0)}}) \times_{(Y,M_Y)} \cdots \times_{(Y,M_Y)} (X^{(0)}, M_{X^{(0)}}))^{\mathrm{ex}},$$

where the fiber product is taken $3(i+1)$-times. So $m(X^{(i)},\mathcal{P}^{(i)})$ is bounded by $(3i+2)d$. So we have $m(X^{(\bullet)},\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}) \leq 8d$. Therefore, if we have $\lambda > p^{-1/(8d(p-1)+1)}$, we have the functor $\Phi : I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \longrightarrow I_{\mathrm{crys}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$.

In order to prove the well-definedness of Φ, we need to make λ closer to 1: Assume we have another embedding system

$$(X, M_X) \xleftarrow{g^{(\bullet)}} (X'^{(\bullet)}, M_{X'^{(\bullet)}}) \overset{i}{\hookrightarrow} (\mathcal{P}'^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}'^{(\bullet)}}) \tag{1.14}$$

as above (satisfying the analogue of (1.13)) and let us define

$$(X, M_X) \xleftarrow{g^{(\bullet)}} (X''^{(\bullet)}, M_{X''^{(\bullet)}}) \overset{i}{\hookrightarrow} (\mathcal{P}''^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}''^{(\bullet)}}) \tag{1.15}$$

by

$$\begin{aligned}(X''^{(\bullet)}, M_{X''^{(\bullet)}}) &:= (X^{(\bullet)}, M_{X^{(\bullet)}}) \times_{(X,M_X)} (X'^{(\bullet)}, M_{X'^{(\bullet)}}),\\ (\mathcal{P}''^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}''^{(\bullet)}}) &:= (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y},M_{\mathcal{Y}})} (\mathcal{P}'^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}'^{(\bullet)}}).\end{aligned}$$

Then $m(X''^{(i)},\mathcal{P}''^{(i)})\,(i=0,1,2)$ is the minimal number of (local) generators of the closed immersion

$$X''^{(i)} \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}''^{(i)}(2), M_{\mathcal{P}''^{(i)}(2)})^{\mathrm{ex}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{F}_p = ((X''^{(0)}, M_{X''^{(0)}}) \times_{(Y,M_Y)} \cdots \times_{(Y,M_Y)} (X''^{(0)}, M_{X''^{(0)}}))^{\mathrm{ex}},$$

where the fiber product is taken $6(i+1)$-times. So we have $m(X''^{(\bullet)},\mathcal{P}''^{(\bullet)}) \leq 17d$. Hence, for $\lambda \in (p^{-1/(17d(p-1)+1)}, 1]$, we have the commutative diagram of functors

(1.16)

$$\begin{tikzcd}
I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \arrow[r, "\sim"] \arrow[d, equal] & \Delta_{\mathrm{conv}} \arrow[r, "\Psi"] \arrow[d] & \Delta_{\mathrm{HPDI}} \arrow[d] & \Delta_{\mathrm{crys}} \arrow[l, "\Lambda"'] \arrow[r, "\sim"] \arrow[d] & I_{\mathrm{crys}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \arrow[d, equal] \\
I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \arrow[r, "\sim"] & \Delta''_{\mathrm{conv}} \arrow[r, "\Psi''"] & \Delta''_{\mathrm{HPDI}} & \Delta''_{\mathrm{crys}} \arrow[l, "\Lambda''"'] \arrow[r, "\sim"] & I_{\mathrm{crys}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \\
I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \arrow[r, "\sim"] \arrow[u, equal] & \Delta'_{\mathrm{conv}} \arrow[r, "\Psi'"] \arrow[u] & \Delta'_{\mathrm{HPDI}} \arrow[u] & \Delta'_{\mathrm{crys}} \arrow[l, "\Lambda'"'] \arrow[r, "\sim"] \arrow[u] & I_{\mathrm{crys}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}),
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\Delta'_{\mathrm{conv}}, \ldots$ are $\Delta_{\mathrm{conv}}, \ldots$ for the embedding system (1.14) and $\Delta''_{\mathrm{conv}}, \ldots$ are $\Delta_{\mathrm{conv}}, \ldots$ for the embedding system (1.15). Then Λ, Λ' are equivalences and Λ'' is fully faithful. From this, we see that the functor $\Phi : I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \longrightarrow I_{\mathrm{crys}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$ induced by the top horizontal arrows in (1.16) is isomorphic to the functor $\Phi' : I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \longrightarrow I_{\mathrm{crys}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$ induced by the bottom horizontal arrows. We can prove, in the same way, that the isomorphism $\Phi \cong \Phi'$ we constructed is canonical (in the sense that it satisfies the cocycle condition) when we have $\lambda \in (p^{-1/(26d(p-1)+1)}, 1]$. (We should consider the fiber product of three embedding systems.) So the functor Φ is canonically defined when we have $\lambda \in (p^{-1/(26d(p-1)+1)}, 1]$. So the proof is finished. □

Now we prove the comparison theorem between relative log convergent cohomology of radius λ and relative log crystalline cohomology. Before the statement of the theorem, we introduce some notations.

Definition 1.36. *Let us assume given the diagram as* (1.11)*. Then we define the integers* $a := a(X)$ *and* $l := l(X, Y, \mathcal{Y})$ *as follows*: a *is the least positive integer such that* X *admits a Zariski covering* $X = \bigcup_{j=1}^{a} X_j$ *by* a *affine open subschemes.* l *is the least positive integer such that* X *admits a Zariski covering* $X = \bigcup_{j=1}^{l} X_j$ *by* l *open subschemes, satisfying the following condition* $(*)$:
$(*)$ *There exists an exact closed immersion* $(X_j, M_{X_j}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}_j, M_{\mathcal{P}_j})$ *over* $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ *such that* $(\mathcal{P}_j, M_{\mathcal{P}_j})$ *is formally log smooth over* $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ *and that* $(\mathcal{P}_j, M_{\mathcal{P}_j}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})} (Y, M_Y) \cong (X, M_X)$ *holds.*

By [Kat, (3.14)], we have $l(X, Y, \mathcal{Y}) \leq a(X)$. So they are finite.

Theorem 1.37. *Assume we are given the diagram* (1.11) *and put*

$$\lambda_0 := p^{-1/(\max(26, 3l(X,Y,\mathcal{Y})-1)d(p-1)+1)}.$$

Then, for $\lambda \in (\lambda_0, 1]$ *and* $\mathcal{E} \in I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$*, we have the quasi-isomorphism*

$$Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{conv}*}\mathcal{E} \overset{\sim}{=} Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{crys}*}\Phi(\mathcal{E}).$$

Proof. Put $l := l(X, Y, \mathcal{Y})$ and let us take a Zariski covering $X = \bigcup_{j=1}^{l} X_j$ and an exact closed immersion $i_j : (X_j, M_{X_j}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}_j, M_{\mathcal{P}_j})$ over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ satisfying the condition $(*)$ in Definition 1.36. Put $J := \{1, 2, \cdots, l\}$ (endowed with usual total order). For non-empty subset $L \subseteq J$, let (X_L, M_{X_L}) (resp. $(\mathcal{P}_L, M_{\mathcal{P}_L})$) be the fiber product of (X_j, M_{X_j})'s (resp. $(\mathcal{P}_j, M_{\mathcal{P}_j})$'s) for $j \in L$ over (X, M_X) (resp. $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$) and let $i_L : (X_L, M_{X_L}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}_L, M_{\mathcal{P}_L})$ be the closed immersion induced by i_j's ($j \in L$). Then, for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(X^{(m)}, M_{X^{(m)}})$ (resp. $(\mathcal{P}^{(m)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(m)}})$) be the disjoint union of (X_L, M_{X_L})'s (resp. $(\mathcal{P}_L, M_{\mathcal{P}_L})$'s) for $L \subseteq J$ with $|L| = m + 1$ and let $i^{(m)} : (X^{(m)}, M_{X^{(m)}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}^{(m)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(m)}})$ be the disjoint union of i_L's for $L \subseteq L$ with $|L| = m + 1$. Then $(X^{(\bullet)}, M_{X^{(\bullet)}}) := \{(X^{(m)}, M_{X^{(m)}})\}_{m \leq l-1}$ and $(\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{(\bullet)}) := \{(\mathcal{P}^{(m)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(m)}})\}_{m \leq l-1}$ naturally forms a diagram indexed by the category Δ_{l-1}^{+} (where Δ_{l-1}^{+} is as in the paragraph before Proposition 1.10) and we have the diagram

$$(X, M_X) \xleftarrow{g} (X^{(\bullet)}, M_{X^{(\bullet)}}) \xrightarrow{i^{(\bullet)}} (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}).$$

Let us denote the p-adically completed PD-envelope of the closed immersion $i^{(\bullet)}$ by $(D^{(\bullet)}, M_{D^{(\bullet)}})$.

For $\lambda \in (p^{-1/(26d(p-1)+1)}, 1]$, we have the functor $\Phi : I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}(X/\mathcal{Y}) \longrightarrow I_{\mathrm{crys}}(X/\mathcal{Y})$ by Proposition 1.35. On the other hand, if we define $m(X^{(j)}, \mathcal{P}^{(j)})$ as in the proof of Proposition 1.35, it is the minimal number of (local) generators of the closed immersion

$$X^{(j)} \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}^{(j)}(2), M_{\mathcal{P}^{(j)}(2)})^{\mathrm{ex}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{F}_p = ((X^{(0)}, M_{X^{(0)}}) \times_{(Y,M_Y)} \cdots \times_{(Y,M_Y)} (X^{(0)}, M_{X^{(0)}}))^{\mathrm{ex}},$$

where the fiber product is taken $3(j+1)$-times. So $m(X^{(j)}, \mathcal{P}^{(j)})$ is bounded by $(3j+2)d$. So if we put $n := (3l-1)d(p-1)+1$, we have the diagram

$$D^{(\bullet)}(i) \longrightarrow T'_{n,1}(\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}(i)) \hookleftarrow T_{n,1}(\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}(i)) \tag{1.17}$$

(where the notation are as in the proof of Proposition 1.35), and by using this diagram, we can define the functor $I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}(X/\mathcal{Y}) \longrightarrow I_{\mathrm{crys}}(X/\mathcal{Y})$ for $\lambda \in (p^{-1/(3l-1)d(p-1)+1}, 1]$, which is identical with Φ when $\lambda \in (\lambda_0, 1]$.

By the diagram (1.17), we can define the map of complexes

$$\mathrm{sp}_* \mathrm{DR}(]X^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)},\lambda}/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{DR}(\mathcal{D}^{(\bullet)}/\mathcal{Y}, \Phi(\mathcal{E})) \tag{1.18}$$

as in [S3, §2], which induces the map

$$Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E} \longrightarrow Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{crys}*}\Phi(\mathcal{E}).$$

(Here $\mathrm{DR}(\mathcal{D}^{(\bullet)}/\mathcal{Y}, \Phi(\mathcal{E}))$ denotes the log de Rham complex on $\mathcal{D}^{(\bullet)}$ associated to $\Phi(\mathcal{E})$. See [S3, §1].) So it suffices to prove that the map (1.18) is a quasi-isomorphism. To see this, first we may replace $\bullet$ by j, and then, we may replace $\mathcal{P}^{(j)}$ by the open subscheme of $\mathcal{P}^{(0)}$ which is naturally homeomorphic to $X^{(j)}$, because the both hand sides are unchanged in derived category. Then we can reduce to the claim in the case $j = 0$, and in this case, both hand sides coincide. So we are done. □

As a corollary, we have the following:

Corollary 1.38. *Assume we are given the diagram*

$$(X, M_X) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, M_Y) \overset{\iota}{\hookrightarrow} (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}),$$

where f is a proper log smooth integral morphism in (LS/B)*, $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ is an object in* $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ *and ι is the exact closed immersion defined by the ideal sheaf $p\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}$. Then, for $\lambda \in (\lambda_0, 1]$ (λ_0 is as in Theorem 1.37) and a locally free isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ on $(X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv}}$, $Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}$ is a perfect complex of $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}$-modules on $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathrm{Zar}}$, that is, it is quasi-isomorphic to a bounded complex of locally free $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}$-modules in the sense of* [S3, 1.9] *Zariski locally on $\mathcal{Y}$.*

Proof. This is the immediate consequence of Theorem 1.37 and [S3, 1.16]. □

Corollary 1.39. *Assume we are given a diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(X', M_{X'}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & (Y', M_{Y'}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & (\mathcal{Y}', M_{\mathcal{Y}'}) \arrow[d, "\varphi"'] \\
(X, M_X) \arrow[r, "f"] & (Y, M_Y) \arrow[r, "\iota"] & (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}),
\end{tikzcd} \tag{1.19}$$

where f is proper log smooth integral, ι is the exact closed immersion defined by the ideal sheaf $p\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ and the squares are Cartesian. Then, for $\lambda \in (\lambda_0, 1]$ (λ_0 is as in Theorem 1.37) and a locally free isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ on $I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$, we have the quasi-isomorphism

$$L\varphi^* Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\sim} Rf_{X'/\mathcal{Y}',\lambda\text{-conv}*}\varphi^*\mathcal{E}.$$

Proof. This is the immediate consequence of Theorem 1.37 and [S3, 1.19]. □

2. Relative log convergent cohomology of radius λ (II)

Assume we are given a diagram

$$(X, M_X) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, M_Y) \overset{\iota}{\hookrightarrow} (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}), \tag{2.1}$$

where f is a proper log smooth integral morphism in (LS$/B$), $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ is an object in (pLFS$/\mathcal{B}$) and ι is a homeomorphic exact closed immersion in (pLFS$/\mathcal{B}$). In this section, we prove the coherence and the base change property for relative log convergent cohomology of radius λ of $(X, M_X)/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ when f has log smooth parameter ([S3, 3.4], see also Definition 2.6) and λ is sufficiently close to 1. The strategy of proof is the same as [S3, §3], but we need more subtle argument to know for which λ the proof works.

The first proposition we need is the topological invariance of the category of isocrystals on relative log convergent site with radius and that of relative log convergent cohomology with radius. Assume that we are given the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(X, M_X) \arrow[r, "i"] \arrow[d, "f"'] & (X_1, M_{X_1}) \arrow[d, "f_1"'] & \\
(Y, M_Y) \arrow[r, "\iota'"] & (Y_1, M_{Y_1}) \arrow[r, "\iota_1"] & (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}),
\end{tikzcd} \tag{2.2}$$

where f, f_1 are morphisms in (LS$/\mathcal{B}$), i, ι' are homeomorphic exact closed immersions in (LS$/\mathcal{B}$), $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ is an object in (pLFS$/\mathcal{B}$), ι_1 is a homeomorphic exact closed immersion in (pLFS$/\mathcal{B}$) and the square is Cartesian. Put $\iota := \iota_1 \circ \iota'$, $\mathcal{I}_0 := \mathrm{Ker}(\iota^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}} \to \mathcal{O}_Y)$ and $r_0 := r(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}, \mathcal{I}_0)$. Then we have, for any $\lambda \in (0, 1]$, the restriction functor

$$i^* : I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X_1/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \longrightarrow I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$$

and for any $\lambda, \lambda' \in (0, 1]$ with $\lambda' > \lambda$, we have another kind of restriction functors

$$I_{\lambda'\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \longrightarrow I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}), \quad I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X_1/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \longrightarrow I_{\lambda'\text{--conv}}((X_1/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}),$$

which we denote by $\mathrm{res}_{\lambda',\lambda}$. Then we have the following propositions:

Proposition 2.1. *Let the notations be as above. Then, for any $\lambda = p^{-r} \in (0, 1]$ and $\lambda' \in (p^{-(r^{-1}+r_0^{-1})^{-1}}, 1]$, there exists a functor*

$$i_* : I_{\lambda'\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \longrightarrow I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X_1/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$$

satisfying the following conditions: With λ, λ' as above, the composite

$$I_{\lambda'\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \xrightarrow{i_*} I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X_1/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \xrightarrow{i^*} I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$$

is equal to $\mathrm{res}_{\lambda',\lambda}$ *and the composite*

$$I_{\lambda'\text{-conv}}((X_1/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \xrightarrow{i^*} I_{\lambda'\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) \xrightarrow{i_*} I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X_1/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$$

is equal to $\mathrm{res}_{\lambda',\lambda}$.

Proof. For $\mathcal{E} \in I_{\lambda'\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$ and an enlargement $\mathcal{Z} := ((\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), (Z, M_Z), j, z)$ of $(X_1, M_{X_1})/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ with $\lambda(\mathcal{Z}) < \lambda$, put $(Z', M_{Z'}) := (Z, M_Z) \times_{(X_1, M_{X_1})} (X, M_X)$ and let $j' : (Z', M_{Z'}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), z' : (Z', M_{Z'}) \longrightarrow (X, M_X)$ be the morphisms naturally induced by j, z. Then $\mathcal{Z}' := ((\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), (Z', M_{Z'}), j', z')$ is an enlargement of $(X, M_X)/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$. If we put $\mathcal{I} := \mathrm{Ker}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}} \to \mathcal{O}_Z)$ and $\mathcal{J} := \mathrm{Ker}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}} \to \mathcal{O}_{Z'})$, we have $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{I}_0\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}$. So we have

$$r(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}, \mathcal{J}) \geq (r(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}, \mathcal{I})^{-1} + r(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}, \mathcal{I}_0\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}})^{-1})^{-1} \geq (r^{-1} + r_0^{-1})^{-1},$$

that is, $\lambda(\mathcal{Z}') < \lambda'$. So we can define $i_*\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{Z})$ by $i_*\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{Z}) := \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{Z}')$. So we have the functor i_*, and we can check the required property easily from this definition. □

Proposition 2.2. *Assume given the diagram* (2.2) *and assume that f_1 is log smooth. Then, for $\lambda \in (p^{-r_0}, 1]$ and $\mathcal{E} \in I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X_1/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$, we have the quasi-isomorphism*

$$Rf_{X_1/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\sim} Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}i^*\mathcal{E}.$$

Proof. We may work locally on X_1. So we may assume that there exists an exact closed immersion $(X_1, M_{X_1}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ such that $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ is formally log smooth over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ and that we have the canonical isomorphism $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})} (Y_1, M_{Y_1}) = (X_1, M_{X_1})$. Then we have $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})} (Y, M_Y) = (X, M_X)$, and from this, one can see the isomorphisms $]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda} \xrightarrow{\cong}]X_1[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda} = \mathcal{P}_K$ for $\lambda \in (p^{-r_0}, 1]$. Then one can see easily that the canonical map of complexes

$$\mathrm{sp}_*\mathrm{DR}(]X_1[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{sp}_*\mathrm{DR}(]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}/\mathcal{Y}_K, i^*\mathcal{E})$$

is an isomorphism. So we are done. □

We also have the following invariance property with respect to the radius:

Proposition 2.3. *Let us assume given the diagram*

$$(X, M_X) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, M_Y) \overset{\iota}{\hookrightarrow} (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}),$$

where f is a log smooth morphism in $(\mathrm{LS}/\mathcal{B})$, *$(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ is an object in* $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ *and ι is a homeomorphic exact closed immersion in* $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$. *Put $r_0 := r(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}, \mathrm{Ker}(\iota^* : \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}} \to \mathcal{O}_Y))$ and let us take $\lambda, \lambda' \in (p^{-r_0}, 1]$ with $\lambda' > \lambda$. Then, for $\mathcal{E} \in I_{\lambda'\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$, the restriction map*

$$Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda'\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E} \longrightarrow Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathrm{res}_{\lambda',\lambda}(\mathcal{E})$$

is a quasi-isomorphism.

Proof. We can reduce to the case that there exists an exact closed immersion $(X, M_X) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ such that $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ is formally log smooth over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ and that we have the canonical isomorphism $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})} (Y, M_Y) = (X, M_X)$. Then we have the isomorphism $]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda} \xrightarrow{\cong}]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda'} = \mathcal{P}_K$ and the proposition follows from this as Proposition 2.2. □

Now let us assume that we are given a diagram (2.1) (with r_0 as above). Then we define the rational number $r(X, Y, \mathcal{Y})$ by

$$r(X, Y, \mathcal{Y}) := ((\max(26, 3a(X) - 1)d(p-1) + 1) + r_0^{-1})^{-1}, \tag{2.3}$$

where $d = \max_{x \in X}(\mathrm{rk}\, \omega^1_{X/Y})$. Then, as a consequence of Propositions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, we have the following:

Corollary 2.4. *Assume given the diagram* (2.1)*, put* $(Y_1, M_{Y_1}) := (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ *and assume that there exists a proper log smooth integral morphism* $(X_1, M_{X_1}) \longrightarrow (Y_1, M_{Y_1})$ *satisfying* $(X_1, M_{X_1}) \times_{(Y_1, M_{Y_1})} (Y, M_Y) = (X, M_X)$*. Then, for* $\lambda \in (p^{-r(X,Y,\mathcal{Y})}, 1]$ *and a locally free isocrystal* $\mathcal{E}$ *on* $(X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv}}$*,* $Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{conv}*}\mathcal{E}$ *is a perfect complex of* $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}$*-modules.*

Proof. Denote the exact closed immersion $(X, M_X) \hookrightarrow (X_1, M_{X_1})$ by i. Then we have $i_*\mathcal{E} \in I_{\lambda'\text{-conv}}((X_1/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$, where $\lambda' := p^{-1/(\log_p(\lambda^{-1})+r_0^{-1})} > p^{-1/(\max(26, 3a(X)-1)d(p-1)+1)}$, and by Propositions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, we have the isomorphism

$$Rf_{X_1/\mathcal{Y},\lambda'\text{-conv}*}i_*\mathcal{E} = Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda'\text{-conv}*}i^*i_*\mathcal{E} = Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda'\text{-conv}*}\mathrm{res}_{\lambda,\lambda'}\mathcal{E} = Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}.$$

So it suffices to see that $Rf_{X_1/\mathcal{Y},\lambda'\text{-conv}*}i_*\mathcal{E}$ is a perfect complex of $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}$-modules. To see this, let us note the inequality $l(X_1, \mathcal{Y}) \leq a(X)$: Indeed, if $X = \bigcup_{j=1}^{a(X)} X^{(j)}$ is a Zariski covering of X by affine open subschemes and if we denote the open subscheme of X_1 which is homeomorphic to $X^{(j)}$ by $X_1^{(j)}$, then $X_1 = \bigcup_{j=1}^{a(X)} X_1^{(j)}$ is a Zariski covering of X_1 by affine open subschemes. So we have $a(X) \geq a(X_1) \geq l(X_1, \mathcal{Y})$. Then the perfectness of $Rf_{X_1/\mathcal{Y},\lambda'\text{-conv}*}i_*\mathcal{E}$ follows from Corollary 1.38. □

Corollary 2.5. *Assume we are given a diagram*

(2.4)

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(X', M_{X'}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & (Y', M_{Y'}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & (\mathcal{Y}', M_{\mathcal{Y}'}) \arrow[d, "\varphi"'] \\
(X, M_X) \arrow[r] & (Y, M_Y) \arrow[r] & (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}),
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the horizontal lines are as in the diagram (2.1) *and the left square is Cartesian. Let* $(Y_1, M_{Y_1}) := (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ *and assume that there exists a proper log smooth integral morphism* $(X_1, M_{X_1}) \longrightarrow (Y_1, M_{Y_1})$ *saisfying* $(X_1, M_{X_1}) \times_{(Y_1, M_{Y_1})} (Y, M_Y) = (X, M_X)$*. Then, for* $\lambda \in (p^{-r(X,Y,\mathcal{Y})}, 1]$ *and a locally free isocrystal* $\mathcal{E}$ *on* $I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$*, we have the canonical quasi-isomorphism*

$$L\varphi^* Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\sim} Rf_{X'/\mathcal{Y}',\lambda\text{-conv}*}\varphi^*\mathcal{E}.$$

Proof. Denote the base change of $(X_1, M_{X_1}) \longrightarrow (Y_1, M_{Y_1}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ by $(\mathcal{Y}', M_{\mathcal{Y}'}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ by $(X_1', M_{X_1'}) \longrightarrow (Y_1', M_{Y_1'}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}', M_{\mathcal{Y}'})$. Then we have $l(X_1', \mathcal{Y}') \leq l(X_1, \mathcal{Y}) \leq a(X)$. Noting this, we can reduce the claim to Corollary 1.39 in the same way as the proof of Corollary 2.4. □

Now let us recall the notion of 'having log smooth parameter', which is defined in [S3, 3.4]:

Definition 2.6. *We say that a proper log smooth integral morphism* $f : (X, M_X) \longrightarrow (Y, M_Y)$ *of fine log* B*-schemes has log smooth parameter in strong sense* (*over*

(B, M_B)), if there exists a diagram of fine log formal B-schemes

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(X, M_X) \arrow[d, "f"'] & (X', M_{X'}) \arrow[l] \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "f'"'] & (X_0, M_{X_0}) \arrow[d, "f_0"'] \\
(Y, M_Y) & (Y', M_{Y'}) \arrow[l, "g"'] \arrow[r, "g'"] & (Y_0, M_{Y_0}),
\end{tikzcd} \tag{2.5}$$

where two squares are Cartesian, g is strict etale and surjective, f_0 is proper log smooth integral and (Y_0, M_{Y_0}) is log smooth over (B, M_B). We say a proper log smooth integral morphism $f : (X, M_X) \longrightarrow (Y, M_Y)$ of fine log B-schemes has log smooth parameter if there exists a decomposition $X = \coprod_i X_i$ into open and closed subschemes such that the composite

$$(X_i, M_X|_{X_i}) \hookrightarrow (X, M_X) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, M_Y)$$

has log smooth parameter in strong sense for each i.

Let us assume given the diagram (2.1) such that f has log smooth parameter in strong sense and take a diagram (2.5). Let $(\mathcal{Y}', M_{\mathcal{Y}'})$ be the fine log formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme which is strict formally etale over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ satisfying $(\mathcal{Y}', M_{\mathcal{Y}'}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})} (Y, M_Y) = (Y', M_{Y'})$ and put $(Y_1', M_{Y_1'}) := (\mathcal{Y}', M_{\mathcal{Y}'}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{F}_p$. Then, by [S3, 3.7], we may assume the following condition $(\star)$ by replacing Y' by its etale covering if necessary:

$(\star)$: The morphism $Y' \longrightarrow Y$ is affine and there exists a proper log smooth integral morphism $(X_1', M_{X_1'}) \longrightarrow (Y_1', M_{Y_1'})$ satisfying $(X_1', M_{X_1'}) \times_{(Y_1', M_{Y_1'})} (Y, M_Y) = (X, M_X)$.

Now let us prove one of the main results in this section:

Theorem 2.7. *Assume we are given the diagram* (2.1) *such that f is a proper log smooth integral morphism having log smooth parameter. Then, for $\lambda \in (p^{-r(X,Y,\mathcal{Y})}, 1]$ and a locally free isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ on $(X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv}}$, $Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}$ is a perfect complex of $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}$-modules.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that in [S3, 3.6]. We may assume that f has log smooth parameter in strong sense. Take a diagram (2.5) satisfying the condition $(\star)$ above. Let $\epsilon : (\mathcal{Y}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{Y}^{(\bullet)}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ be the strict formally etale Čech hypercovering associated to the morphism $(\mathcal{Y}', M_{\mathcal{Y}'}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$. We denote the base change of the diagram (2.1) by $(\mathcal{Y}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{Y}^{(\bullet)}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ by

$$(X^{(\bullet)}, M_{X^{(\bullet)}}) \longrightarrow (Y^{(\bullet)}, M_{Y^{(\bullet)}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{Y}^{(\bullet)}}).$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\pi : (\mathcal{Y}^{(n)}, M_{\mathcal{Y}^{(n)}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}^{(0)}, M_{\mathcal{Y}^{(0)}}) = (\mathcal{Y}', M_{\mathcal{Y}'})$ be one of the projections and denote by $(X_1^{(n)}, M_{X_1^{(n)}}) \longrightarrow (Y_1^{(n)}, M_{Y_1^{(n)}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}^{(n)}, M_{\mathcal{Y}^{(n)}})$ the base change of the diagram $(X_1', M_{X_1'}) \longrightarrow (Y_1', M_{Y_1'}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ by π. Then we have $(X_1^{(n)}, M_{X_1^{(n)}}) \times_{(Y_1^{(n)}, M_{Y_1^{(n)}})} (Y^{(n)}, M_{Y^{(n)}}) = (X^{(n)}, M_{X^{(n)}})$ for each n. (Note that $(X_1^{(n)}, M_{X_1^{(n)}})$, $(Y_1^{(n)}, M_{Y_1^{(n)}})$ does not form a simplicial log scheme.) Since

$Y^{(n)} \longrightarrow Y$ is affine, we have $a(X^{(n)}) \leq a(X)$ and so we have $r(X^{(n)}, Y^{(n)}, \mathcal{Y}^{(n)}) \geq r(X, Y, \mathcal{Y})$. So, if we denote the restriction of $\mathcal{E}$ to $I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X^{(\bullet)}/\mathcal{Y}^{(\bullet)})^{\log})$ by $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$, $Rf_{X^{(n)}/\mathcal{Y}^{(n)},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}^{(n)}$ is perfect for each n, by Corollary 2.4.

Next we prove the quasi-isomorphism

$$Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E} = R\epsilon_* Rf_{X^{(\bullet)}/\mathcal{Y}^{(\bullet)},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}. \tag{2.6}$$

To see this, we can assume that (X, M_X) admits an exact closed immersion $(X, M_X) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ to a fine log formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ which is formally log smooth over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ and satisfies $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})} (Y, M_Y) = (X, M_X)$. In this case, we have the strict formally etale Čech hypercovering $\delta : (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ satisfying $(\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})} (Y, M_Y) = (X^{(\bullet)}, M_{X^{(\bullet)}})$ since we have $\mathcal{P}_{\text{et}} \simeq X_{\text{et}}$. If we denote the morphism $\mathcal{P} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ by h, we have

$$Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E} = Rh_*\mathrm{sp}_*\mathrm{DR}(\mathcal{P}_K/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}),$$

$$R\epsilon_* Rf_{X^{(\bullet)}/\mathcal{Y}^{(\bullet)},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)} = Rh_* R\delta_*\mathrm{sp}_*^{(\bullet)}\mathrm{DR}(\mathcal{P}_K^{(\bullet)}/\mathcal{Y}_K^{(\bullet)}, \mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}).$$

(Note that we have $]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda} = \mathcal{P}_K,]X^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)},\lambda} = \mathcal{P}_K^{(\bullet)}$ since we have $\lambda > p^{-r_0}$.) Using this, we can prove the quasi-isomorphism (2.6) in the same way as [S3, 3.6].

By (2.6), we have the spectral sequence

$$E_2^{s,t} = R^s\epsilon_* R^t f_{X^{(\bullet)}/\mathcal{Y}^{(\bullet)},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)} \Longrightarrow R^{s+t} f_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}.$$

Note that $(R^t f_{X^{(\bullet)}/\mathcal{Y}^{(\bullet)},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)})_n = R^t f_{X^{(n)}/\mathcal{Y}^{(n)},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}^{(n)}$ is known to be isocoherent and that they are compatible with respect to n by Corollary 2.5. (Since we have $r(X^{(n)}, Y^{(n)}, \mathcal{Y}^{(n)}) \geq r(X, Y, \mathcal{Y})$, we can use Corollary 2.5.) So there exists (by etale descent of isocoherent sheaves) an isocoherent sheaf $\mathcal{F}^t$ on $\mathcal{Y}$ such that $\mathcal{F}^t \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}^{(\bullet)}} = R^t f_{X^{(\bullet)}/\mathcal{Y}^{(\bullet)},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ holds. Then we have

$$R^s\epsilon_* R^t f_{X^{(\bullet)}/\mathcal{Y}^{(\bullet)},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)} = \mathcal{F}^t \ (s = 0), \ \ 0 \ (s > 0).$$

So we have $R^q f_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{F}^q$ and it is isocoherent. Moreover, $Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}$ is bounded and it has finite tor-dimension Zariski locally because so does $Rf_{X^{(0)}/\mathcal{Y}^{(0)},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}^{(0)} = Rf_{X^{(0)}/\mathcal{Y}^{(0)},\text{crys}*}\Phi(\mathcal{E}^{(0)})$. Therefore $Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}$ is a perfect complex of $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}$-modules. □

Remark 2.8. As in [S3, 3.8], we have the following: With the notation in the proof of Theorem 2.7, we have the isomorphism

$$R^q f_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}^{(n)}} = R^q f_{X^{(n)}/\mathcal{Y}^{(n)},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}^{(n)}.$$

Next we prove the base change property, which is the second main result in this section.

Theorem 2.9. *Assume we are given a diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(X'', M_{X''}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & (Y'', M_{Y''}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & (\mathcal{Y}'', M_{\mathcal{Y}''}) \arrow[d, "\varphi"'] \\
(X, M_X) \arrow[r, "f"] & (Y, M_Y) \arrow[r] & (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}),
\end{tikzcd} \tag{2.7}$$

where the horizontal lines are as in Theorem 2.7 and the left square is Cartesian. Then, for $\lambda \in (p^{-r(X,Y,\mathcal{Y})}, 1]$ *and a locally free isocrystal* $\mathcal{E}$ *on* $I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$*, we have the quasi-isomorphism*

$$L\varphi^* Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{conv}*}\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\sim} Rf_{X''/\mathcal{Y}'',\mathrm{conv}*}\varphi^*\mathcal{E}.$$

Proof. The proof is the same as [S3, 3.9]. So we only give a sketch. We may assume that f has log smooth parameter in strong sense. If we take the diagram (2.5) satisfying the condition ($\star$), we see that it suffices to prove the theorem after pulling-back the diagram (2.7) by $(\mathcal{Y}', M_{\mathcal{Y}'}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$. (We use Remark 2.8 here.) Then the theorem is reduced to Corollary 2.5. □

Recall that a morphism $(\mathcal{Y}', M_{\mathcal{Y}'}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ is said to be analytically flat if the induced functor $\mathrm{Coh}(\mathbb{Q}\otimes\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Coh}(\mathbb{Q}\otimes\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}'})$ is exact. Then, as in [S3, 3.10], we have the following result, which is a corollary of Corollary 2.5 and Theorem 2.9:

Corollary 2.10. *Assume we are given a diagram in* $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(X', M_{X'}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & (Y', M_{Y'}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & (\mathcal{Y}', M_{\mathcal{Y}'}) \arrow[d, "\varphi"'] \\
(X, M_X) \arrow[r, "f"] & (Y, M_Y) \arrow[r, "\iota"] & (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}),
\end{tikzcd}$$

where f *is a proper log smooth integral morphism,* ι *is a homeomorphic exact closed immersion and the left square is Cartesian. Let* $\lambda \in (p^{-r(X,Y,\mathcal{Y})}, 1]$ *and let* $\mathcal{E}$ *be a locally free isocrystal on* $(X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv}}$. *Assume one of the conditions* (1), (1)$'$ *below and one of the conditions* (2), (2)$'$ *below are true*:

(1) φ *is analytically flat.*

(1)$'$ $R^q f_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}$ *is a locally free* $\mathbb{Q}\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}$*-module* (*in the sense of* [S3, 1.9]) *for any* q.

(2) f *has log smooth parameter.*

(2)$'$ *If we put* $(Y_1, M_{Y_1}) := (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$*, there exists a proper log smooth integral morphism* $(X_1, M_{X_1}) \longrightarrow (Y_1, M_{Y_1})$ *satisfying* $(X_1, M_{X_1}) \times_{(Y_1, M_{Y_1})} (Y, M_Y) = (X, M_X)$.

Then we have the canonical isomorphism

$$\varphi^* R^q f_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\cong} R^q f_{X'/\mathcal{Y}',\lambda\text{-conv}*}\varphi^*\mathcal{E} \quad (q \in \mathbb{N}).$$

In the case where the condition (1) is satisfied, we call the result of Corollary 2.10 'analytically flat base change theorem'.

3. Relative log analytic cohomology of radius λ

In this section, first we introduce 'radius λ version' of the relative log analytic cohomology introduced in [S3, §4]. Then we prove the relation between relative log convergent cohomology of radius λ and the relative log analytic cohomology of radius λ for proper log smooth integral morphisms having log smooth parameter when λ is sufficiently close to 1. This implies the coherence of relative log analytic cohomology under the same assumption on λ. After that, we prove the existence of a canonical structure of an isocrystal on relative log analytic cohomology of radius λ. The proofs are again similar to [S3, §4], but we need more subtle argument.

First we give a definition of relative log analytic cohomology of radius λ.

Definition 3.1. *Assume we are given a diagram*

$$(X, M_X) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, M_Y) \overset{\iota}{\hookrightarrow} (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}), \tag{3.1}$$

where f is a morphism in (LS/B) *and ι is a closed immersion in* $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$. *Let $\lambda \in (0,1]$ and let $\mathcal{E}$ be an isocrystal on $(X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv}}$. Take an embedding system*

$$(X, M_X) \xleftarrow{g} (X^{(\bullet)}, M_{X^{(\bullet)}}) \overset{i}{\hookrightarrow} (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}), \tag{3.2}$$

let $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ be the restriction of $\mathcal{E}$ to $(X^{(\bullet)}, M_{X^{(\bullet)}})$, let $\mathrm{DR}(]X^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)},\lambda}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)})$ be the log de Rham complex associated to $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ and let h be the morphism $]X^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)},\lambda} \longrightarrow]Y[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Y},\lambda}$. Then we define $Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-an}*}\mathcal{E}, R^q f_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-an}*}\mathcal{E}$ by

$$Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-an}*}\mathcal{E} := Rh_*\mathrm{DR}(]X^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)},\lambda}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}),$$

$$R^q f_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-an}*}\mathcal{E} := R^q h_*\mathrm{DR}(]X^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)},\lambda}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)})$$

and we call $R^q f_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-an}*}\mathcal{E}$ the q-th relative log analytic cohomology of $(X, M_X)/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ of radius λ with coefficient $\mathcal{E}$. It is a sheaf of $\mathcal{O}_{]Y[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Y},\lambda}}$-modules.

Remark 3.2. We have the remark similar to [S3, 4.2]: With the above notation, put $\lambda = p^{-r}$. Let $\{(\mathcal{Y}_{a,b}, M_{\mathcal{Y}_{a,b}})\}_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}}$ be the system of universal enlargements of $((\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}), (Y, M_Y), \iota, \mathrm{id})$ and denote the base change of the diagrams (3.1) by $(\mathcal{Y}_{a,b}, M_{\mathcal{Y}_{a,b}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ by

$$(X_{a,b}, M_{X_{a,b}}) \longrightarrow (Y_{a,b}, M_{Y_{a,b}}) \overset{\iota}{\hookrightarrow} (\mathcal{Y}_{a,b}, M_{\mathcal{Y}_{a,b}}).$$

Then we have $]Y[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Y},\lambda} = \bigcup_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}_r} \mathcal{Y}_{a,b,K}$ and if we denote the restriction of $\mathcal{E}$ to $I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((X_{a,b}/\mathcal{Y}_{a,b})^{\log})$ by $\mathcal{E}_{a,b}$, $R^q f_{X_{a,b}/\mathcal{Y}_{a,b},\lambda\text{-an}*}\mathcal{E}_{a,b}$ is nothing but the restriction of $R^q f_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-an}*}\mathcal{E}$ to $\mathcal{Y}_{a,b,K}$.

As in [S3, 4.3], we should prove the following proposition:

Proposition 3.3. *Let the notations be as in Definition 3.1. Then the definition of the relative log analytic cohomology $R^q f_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-an}*}\mathcal{E}$ of radius λ is independent of the choice of the embedding system.*

The proof of Proposition 3.3 is the same as that of [S3, 4.3], once we establish Lemmas 3.4, 3.5 below (which correspond to [S3, 4.4, 4.5]). So we only give a proof of the following two key lemmas:

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\lambda \in (0,1]$ and assume we are given the Cartesian diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(X^{(\bullet)}, M_{X^{(\bullet)}}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}) \arrow[d, "g"'] \\
(X, M_X) \arrow[r, "\iota"] & (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}),
\end{tikzcd} \tag{3.3}$$

where (X, M_X) *is an object in* (LS/B), $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ *is an object in* $(\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$, ι *is a closed immersion and* g *is a strict formally etale hypercovering. Let* $g_K :]X^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)},\lambda} \longrightarrow]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}$ *be the morphism induced by* g *and let* $\mathcal{E}$ *be a coherent* $\mathcal{O}_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}}$*-module. Then we have the isomorphism*

$$\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{=} Rg_{K,*}g_K^*\mathcal{E}.$$

Proof. Let $\{(\mathcal{P}_{a,b}, M_{\mathcal{P}_{a,b}})\}_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}}$ be the system of universal enlargements of the pre-widening $((\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}), (X, M_X), \iota, i)$ and let

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(X^{(\bullet)}_{a,b}, M_{X^{(\bullet)}_{a,b}}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}_{a,b}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}_{a,b}}) \arrow[d, "g_{a,b}"'] \\
(X_{a,b}, M_{X_{a,b}}) \arrow[r, "\iota"] & (\mathcal{P}_{a,b}, M_{\mathcal{P}_{a,b}})
\end{tikzcd}$$

be the diagram obtained by applying $\times_{(\mathcal{P},M_{\mathcal{P}})}(\mathcal{P}_{a,b}, M_{\mathcal{P}_{a,b}})$ to the diagram (3.3). Let $g_{a,b,K} : P^{(\bullet)}_{a,b,K} \longrightarrow P_{a,b,K}$ be the map induced by $g_{a,b}$. Then, if we put $r := -\log_p \lambda$, we have

$$]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda} = \bigcup_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}_r} \mathcal{P}_{a,b,K}, \quad]X^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)},\lambda} = \bigcup_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}_r} \mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}_{a,b,K},$$

$$g_K^{-1}(\mathcal{P}_{a,b,K}) = \mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}_{a,b,K}, \quad g_{a,b,K} = g_K|_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}_{a,b,K}}.$$

So we have $(Rg_{K,*}g_K^*\mathcal{E})|_{\mathcal{P}_{a,b,K}} = Rg_{a,b,K,*}g^*_{a,b,K}(\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{P}_{a,b,K}})$ for $(a,b) \in \mathbf{A}_r$ and so it suffices to prove the isomorphism $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{P}_{a,b,K}} \xrightarrow{=} Rg_{a,b,K,*}g^*_{a,b,K}(\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{P}_{a,b,K}})$. This is proven in [Ch-T, 7.3.3]. □

Lemma 3.5. *Let* $\lambda \in (0,1]$, *let* $(X, M_X) \longrightarrow (Y, M_Y) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ *be as in Definition 3.1 and assume we are given a commutative diagram over* $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(X, M_X) \arrow[r, "\iota_1"] \arrow[d, equal] & (\mathcal{P}_1, M_{\mathcal{P}_1}) \arrow[d, "\varphi"'] \\
(X, M_X) \arrow[r, "\iota_2"] & (\mathcal{P}_2, M_{\mathcal{P}_2}),
\end{tikzcd} \tag{3.4}$$

where $(\mathcal{P}_j, M_{\mathcal{P}_j})\,(j = 1,2)$ *is an object in* $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ *which is formally log smooth over* $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$, $\iota_j\,(j = 1,2)$ *is a closed immersion and* φ *is a fornally log smooth morphism. Let* $\varphi_K :]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_1,\lambda} \longrightarrow]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_2,\lambda}$ *be a morphism of log tubular neighborhoods induced by* φ *and let* $\mathcal{E}$ *be an isocrystal on* $(X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv}}$. *Then we have a quasi-isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{DR}(]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_2,\lambda}/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \xrightarrow{=} R\varphi_{K,*}\mathrm{DR}(]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_1,\lambda}/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}).$$

Proof. The proof of similar to that of [S3, 4.5]. For $j = 1,2$, let $\mathcal{P}_j^{\mathrm{ex}}$ be the exactification of the closed immersion ι_j. Then it suffices to prove the lemma Zariski locally on $\mathcal{P}_2^{\mathrm{ex}}$. So we may assume that $\mathcal{P}_2^{\mathrm{ex}} = \operatorname{Spf} A$ is affine, $\mathcal{P}_1^{\mathrm{ex}} = \operatorname{Spf} A[[t_1, \cdots, t_r]]$ for some r and the morphism $\varphi^{\mathrm{ex}} : \mathcal{P}_1^{\mathrm{ex}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}_2^{\mathrm{ex}}$ is induced by the canonical inclusion $A \hookrightarrow A[[t_1, \cdots, t_r]]$. Then we have the isomorphism $]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_1,\lambda} \cong]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_2,\lambda} \times D^r_\lambda$ (where D^r_λ

is the r-dimensional open polydisc of radius λ) and the morphism φ_K is equal to the projection $]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_2,\lambda} \times D^r_\lambda \longrightarrow]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_2,\lambda}$. Let $\Omega^\bullet$ be the complex

$$[\mathcal{O}_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_1,\lambda}} \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} \mathcal{O}_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_1,\lambda}} dt_i \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{1 \le i_1 < i_2 \le r} \mathcal{O}_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_1,\lambda}} dt_{i_1} \wedge dt_{i_2} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_1,\lambda}} dt_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dt_r].$$

Then $\mathrm{DR}(]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_1,\lambda}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E})$ is equal to the total complex associated to the double complex $\varphi_K^* \mathrm{DR}(]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_2,\lambda}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_1,\lambda}}} \Omega^\bullet$. So, to prove the lemma, it suffices to prove the quasi-isomorphism

$$E \xrightarrow{\simeq} R\varphi_{K,*}(\varphi_K^* E \otimes \Omega^\bullet) = \varphi_{K,*}(\varphi_K^* E \otimes \Omega^\bullet) = E \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_2,\lambda}}} \varphi_{K,*}\Omega^\bullet$$

for a coherent $\mathcal{O}_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_2,\lambda}}$-module E. This is reduced to showing that the complex $\mathcal{O}_{]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_2,\lambda}} \longrightarrow \varphi_{K,*}\Omega^\bullet$ is homotopic to zero. We can prove it in the same way as the proof of Lemma 1.32 (see also [S3, 2.32]). So we are done. □

We have the following independence result with respect to radius:

Proposition 3.6. *Assume we are given a diagram*

$$(X, M_X) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, M_Y) \overset{\iota}{\hookrightarrow} (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}), \tag{3.5}$$

where f is a log smooth morphism in (LS/B) *and ι is a closed immersion in* $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$. *Let $\lambda, \lambda' \in (0,1]$ with $\lambda' > \lambda$. Then, for an isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ on $(X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda'\text{-conv}}$, we have the quasi-isomorphism*

$$(Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda'\text{-an}*}\mathcal{E})|_{]Y[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Y},\lambda}} \xrightarrow{=} Rf_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-an}*}\mathrm{res}_{\lambda',\lambda}\mathcal{E}.$$

Proof. Put $\lambda = p^{-r}$. For $(a,b) \in \mathbf{A}_r$, let

$$(X_{a,b}, M_{X_{a,b}}) \longrightarrow (Y_{a,b}, M_{Y_{a,b}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}_{a,b}, M_{\mathcal{Y}_{a,b}}) \tag{3.6}$$

be as in Remark 3.2. To prove the quasi-isomorphism, we may check it on $\mathcal{Y}_{a,b,K}$ for $(a,b) \in \mathbf{A}_r$. So, by Remark 3.2, we may replace the diagram (3.5) by the diagram (3.6) to prove the proposition: So, if we put $r_0 := r(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}, \mathrm{Ker}(\iota^* : \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}} \to \mathcal{O}_Y))$, we may assume $r_0 < r$. Then we can prove the proposition in the same way as Proposition 2.3. □

The next theorem establishes the relation of relative log convergent cohomology of radius λ and relative log analytic cohomology of radius λ:

Theorem 3.7. *Assume we are given a diagram*

$$(X, M_X) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, M_Y) \overset{\iota}{\hookrightarrow} (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}), \tag{3.7}$$

where f is a proper log smooth integral morphism having log smooth parameter in (LS/B) *and ι is a homeomorphic exact closed immersion in* $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$. *Then, for $\lambda \in (p^{-r(X,Y,\mathcal{Y})}, 1]$, a locally free isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ on $(X/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv}}$ and $q \ge 0$, $R^q f_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-an}*}\mathcal{E}$ is a coherent sheaf on $]Y[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Y},\lambda} = \mathcal{Y}_K$ and we have the isomorphism $\mathrm{sp}_* R^q f_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-an}*}\mathcal{E} = R^q f_{X/\mathcal{Y},\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}$.*

Proof. We can prove the theorem exactly in the same way as [S3, 4.6], using Theorem 2.7 and Corollary 2.10. □

Next we prove the existence of a structure of an isocrystal on relative log convergent cohomology with radius. For a proper log smooth integral morphism $(X, M_X) \longrightarrow (Y, M_Y)$ in (LS/B) and $\mu \in (0,1]$, we define $r(X,Y;\mu) \in (0,\infty]$ by

(3.8)
$$r(X,Y;\mu) := ((\max(26, 3a(X)-1)d(p-1)+1) - (\log_p \mu)^{-1})^{-1},$$

where $d := \max_{x\in X} \mathrm{rk}\,(\omega^1_{X/Y})$. Then we have the following:

Theorem 3.8. *Assume we are given a diagram*

$$(X, M_X) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, M_Y) \xrightarrow{g} (\mathcal{S}, M_{\mathcal{S}}),$$

where f is a proper log smooth integral morphism having log smooth parameter in (LS/B) and g is a morphism in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$. Let $\mu = p^{-r} \in (0,1]$ and fix $\lambda \in (p^{r(X,Y;\mu)}, 1]$. Then, for a locally free isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ on $(X/\mathcal{S})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv}}$ and a non-negative integer q, there exists a unique isocrystal $\mathcal{F}$ on $(Y/\mathcal{S})^{\log}_{\mu\text{-conv}}$ satisfying the following condition: For any pre-widening $\mathcal{Z} := ((\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), (Z, M_Z), i, z)$ such that z is a strict morphism and that $(\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}})$ is formally log smooth over $(\mathcal{S}, M_{\mathcal{S}})$, the restriction of $\mathcal{F}$ to $I_{\mu\text{-conv}}((Z/\mathcal{S})^{\log}) \cong \mathrm{Str}'_\mu((Z \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Z}/\mathcal{S})^{\log})$ is functorially given by $\{(R^q f_{X\times_Y Z_{a,b}/T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}),\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}, \epsilon_{a,b})\}_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}_r}$, where

$$\{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})\}_{(a,b)} := \{((T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}), M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})}), (Z_{a,b}, M_{Z_{a,b}}))\}_{(a,b)}$$

is the system of universal enlargement of $\mathcal{Z}$ and $\epsilon_{a,b}$ is the isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} p^*_{2,(a,b)} Rf_{X\times_Y Z_{a,b}/T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}),\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E} &\xrightarrow{\simeq} Rf_{X\times_Y Z(1)_{a,b}/T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}(1)),\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E} \\ &\xleftarrow{\simeq} p^*_{1,(a,b)} Rf_{X\times_Y Z_{a,b}/T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}),\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}. \end{aligned}$$

(Here $(\mathcal{Z}(1), M_{\mathcal{Z}(1)}) := (\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}) \times_{(\mathcal{S}, M_{\mathcal{S}})} (\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}})$,

$$\{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}(1))\}_{(a,b)} := \{((T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}(1)), M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}(1))}), (Z(1)_{a,b}, M_{Z(1)_{a,b}}))\}_{(a,b)}$$

is the system of universal enlargements of $((\mathcal{Z}(1), M_{\mathcal{Z}(1)}), (Z, M_Z))$ and $p_{i,(a,b)}$ is the morphism $(T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}(1)), M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}(1))}) \longrightarrow (T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z}), M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Z})})$ induced by the i-th projection.)

Proof. The proof is similar to that of [S3, 4.8]. First let us define $\mathcal{F}$ in the case where there exists a closed immersion $(Y, M_Y) \overset{\iota}{\hookrightarrow} (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ over $(\mathcal{S}, M_{\mathcal{S}})$ such that $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ is formally log smooth over $(\mathcal{S}, M_{\mathcal{S}})$. Let $(\mathcal{P}(i), M_{\mathcal{P}(i)})$ $(i = 0,1,2)$ be the $(i+1)$-fold fiber product of $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ over $(\mathcal{S}, M_{\mathcal{S}})$ and denote the canonical closed immersion $(Y, M_Y) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}(i), M_{\mathcal{P}(i)})$ induced by ι by $\iota(i)$. Denote the system of universal enlargements of $((\mathcal{P}(i), M_{\mathcal{P}(i)}), (Y, M_Y), \iota(i), \mathrm{id})$ by $\{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}(i)) := ((T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}(i)), M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}(i))}), (Z_{a,b}(i), M_{Z_{a,b}(i)}))\}_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}}$ and denote the pull-back of f by $(Z_{a,b}(i), M_{Z_{a,b}(i)}) \longrightarrow (Y, M_Y)$ by $(X_{a,b}(i), M_{X_{a,b}(i)}) \longrightarrow (Z_{a,b}(i), M_{Z_{a,b}(i)})$. Then, since the morphism $(Z_{a,b}(i), M_{Z_{a,b}(i)}) \longrightarrow (Y, M_Y)$ is affine, we have $a(X_{a,b}(i)) \le a(X)$. So, for $(a,b) \in \mathbf{A}_r$, we have $r(X_{a,b}(i), Z_{a,b}(i), T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}(i))) \le r(X,Y;\mu)$. So if we put $\mathcal{F}_{a,b}(i) := R^q f_{X_{a,b}(i)/T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}(i)),\lambda\text{-conv}*}\mathcal{E}$, it is isocoherent and it satisfies the analytically flat base change property. Note first that the transition morphisms $(T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}(0)), M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}(0))}) \longrightarrow (T_{a',b'}(\mathcal{P}(0)), M_{T_{a',b'}(\mathcal{P}(0))})$ $((a,b) \succ (a',b'))$ are analytically flat ([S3, 3.11]). So, by analytically flat base change theorem, the family $\{\mathcal{F}_{a,b}(0)\}_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}_r}$ defines a compatible family of isocoherent sheaves on $\{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}(0))\}_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}_r}$. Let us note next that the projections $(T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}(i+1)), M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}(i+1))}) \longrightarrow (T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}(i)), M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}(i))})$ are analytically flat. (This can be shown exactly by the same proof as [S3, 3.12].) So, again by analytically flat base change theorem, $\{\mathcal{F}_{a,b}(1)\}_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}_r}, \{\mathcal{F}_{a,b}(2)\}_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}_r}$ induce a structure of compatible family of stratification on $\{\mathcal{F}_{a,b}(0)\}_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}_r}$. In this way, $\{\mathcal{F}_{a,b}(i)\}_{(a,b),i}$ induces an object $\mathcal{F}$ in $\mathrm{Str}'_{\mu}((Y \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{S})^{\log}) = I_{\mu\text{-conv}}((Y/\mathcal{S})^{\log})$.

Next we define the isocrystal $\mathcal{F}$ in general case. Take an embedding system

$$(Y, M_Y) \xleftarrow{g} (Y^{(\bullet)}, M_{Y^{(\bullet)}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}})$$

such that g is a strict formally etale Čech hypercovering with $Y^{(0)} \longrightarrow Y$ affine and that $(\mathcal{P}^{(i)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(i)}})$ is the $(i+1)$-fold fiber product of $(\mathcal{P}^{(0)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(0)}})$ over $(\mathcal{S}, M_{\mathcal{S}})$. Let us denote the pull-back of f by $(Y^{(i)}, M_{Y^{(i)}}) \longrightarrow (Y, M_Y)$ by $(X^{(i)}, M_{X^{(i)}}) \longrightarrow (Y^{(i)}, M_{Y^{(i)}})$. Then, since $Y^{(i)} \longrightarrow Y$ is affine, we have $r(X^{(i)}, Y^{(i)}; \mu) \leq r(X, Y, \mu)$. Hence, by the construction in the previous paragraph for $(Y^{(i)}, M_{Y^{(i)}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}^{(i)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(i)}})$, we have $\mathcal{F}^{(i)} \in I_{\mathrm{conv}}((Y^{(i)}/\mathcal{S})^{\log})$ $(i = 0, 1, 2)$ and they are compatible thanks to analytically flat base change theorem. So, by etale descent of isocrystals on relative log convergent site of radius μ, $\{\mathcal{F}^{(i)}\}_{i=0,1,2}$ descents to an isocrystal $\mathcal{F}$ on $(Y/\mathcal{S})^{\log}_{\mu\text{-conv}}$.

Note that the isocrystal $\mathcal{F}$ constructed in the previous paragraph satisfies the required condition for $\mathcal{Z} = ((\mathcal{P}^{(i)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(i)}}), (Y^{(i)}, M_{Y^{(i)}}))$ $(i = 0, 1, 2)$. By etale descent for isocrystals on relative log convergent site of radius μ, this property characterizes $\mathcal{F}$. So we have the uniqueness of $\mathcal{F}$.

We can check that the isocrystal $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies the required property in the same way as [S3, 4.8]. So we are done. □

As a corollary, we have the existence of a structure of isocrystal on relative log analytic cohomology with radius.

Corollary 3.9. *Assume we are given a diagram*

$$(X, M_X) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, M_Y) \xrightarrow{g} (\mathcal{S}, M_{\mathcal{S}}),$$

where f is a proper log smooth integral morphism having log smooth parameter in (LS/B) *and g is a morphism in* (pLFS/$\mathcal{B}$). *Let $\mu \in (0,1]$. Then, for $\lambda \in (p^{-r(X,Y;\mu)}, 1]$, a locally free isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ on $(X/\mathcal{S})^{\log}_{\lambda\text{-conv}}$ and a non-negative integer q, there exists a unique isocrystal $\mathcal{F}$ on $(Y/\mathcal{S})^{\log}_{\mu\text{-conv}}$ such that, for any pre-widening $\mathcal{Z} := ((\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}), (Z, M_Z), i, z)$ of $(Y, M_Y)/(\mathcal{S}, M_{\mathcal{S}})$ such that z is strict and $(\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}})$ is formally log smooth over $(\mathcal{S}, M_{\mathcal{S}})$, $\mathcal{F}$ induces, via the functor*

$$I_{\mu\text{-conv}}((Y/\mathcal{S})^{\log}) \longrightarrow I_{\mu\text{-conv}}((Z/\mathcal{S})^{\log}) \simeq \mathrm{Str}''_{\mu}((Z \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Z}/\mathcal{S})^{\log}),$$

an object of the form $(R^q f_{X\times_Y Z/\mathcal{Z},\mu\text{-an}*}\mathcal{E}, \epsilon)$, where ϵ is the canonical isomorphism

$$p_2^* R^q f_{X\times_Y Z/\mathcal{Z},\mu\text{-an}*}\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\sim} R^q f_{X\times_Y Z/\mathcal{Z}(1),\mu\text{-an}*}\mathcal{E} \xleftarrow{\sim} p_1^* R^q f_{X\times_Y Z/\mathcal{Z},\mu\text{-an}*}\mathcal{E}.$$

(Here $(\mathcal{Z}(1), M_{\mathcal{Z}(1)}) := (\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}}) \times_{(\mathcal{S},M_{\mathcal{S}})} (\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}})$ *and* p_i *denotes the* i*-th projection* $]Z[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Z}(1),\mu} \longrightarrow]Z[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Z},\mu}$*.)*

Proof. It is immediate from Theorems 3.8, 3.7 and Proposition 3.6. Detail is left to the reader. □

4. RELATIVE LOG RIGID COHOMOLOGY AND ITS λ-RESTRICTION

In this section, first we introduce the notion of relative log rigid cohomology of log pairs, which is a log version of relative rigid cohomology. Then we prove a relation between relative rigid cohomology and relative log rigid cohomology in certain case. We also introduce the notion of λ-restriction of relative log rigid cohomology for $\lambda \in (0,1)$ and compare it with relative log rigid cohomology. The results in this section is used in the next section, where we prove the coherence and the overconvergence of relative rigid cohomology in the case where a given morphism of pairs admits a nice log structure.

The treatment of relative log rigid cohomology here is not complete. Here we give a part of the theory of relative log rigid cohomology which is related to the purpose of this paper. We hope to develop a more general theory of relative log rigid cohomology in a future paper.

From now on, we assume that the log structure $M_{\mathcal{B}}$ *on the base log formal scheme* $\mathcal{B}$ *is trivial.* All the pairs (resp. all the triples) (for definition, see [Ch-T, 2.1, 2.3], [S3, §5]) are assumed to be pairs over (B, B) (resp. triples over $(B, B, \mathcal{B})$) whose structure morphism is separated of finite type and all the morphisms of pairs (resp. triples) are assumed to be a separated morphism of finite type over (B, B) (resp. $(B, B, \mathcal{B})$). As for notation on overconvergent isocrystals and relative rigid cohomologies, we follow the notation in [S3, §5]. (Note that some notations are different from that in [Ch-T].)

A log pair is a pair of fine log B-schemes $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}))$ endowed with a strict open immersion $(X, M_X) \hookrightarrow (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}})$ over B. A log triple is a triple $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}), (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}))$, where $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}))$ is a log pair, $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ is a fine log formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme endowed with a closed immersion $(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$. A morphism of log pairs or log triples is defined in natural way. For a log triple $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}), (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}))$, a strict neighborhood of $]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$ in $]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$ is defined to be an admissible open subset V such that $\{V,]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{P} -]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}\}$ forms an admissible covering of $]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$. For a sheaf E on a strict neighborhood V, we define the sheaf of overconvergent sections $j^{\dagger}_V E$ by $j^{\dagger}_V E := \varinjlim_U \alpha_{U]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{X}*} \alpha^{-1}_{UV} E$, where U runs through the strict neighborhoods contained in V and α_{TS} denotes the admissible open immersion $T \hookrightarrow S$. In the case $V =]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$, we denote $j^{\dagger}_V E$ by $j^{\dagger}E$ or $j^{\dagger}_X E$, by abuse of notation. As in the case without log structures, any coherent $j^{\dagger}_X \mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}}$-module has the form $j^{\dagger}_V E$ for some strict neighborhood V and a coherent $\mathcal{O}_V$-module E. (See also the paragraph before Proposition 4.11.)

Now let us assume given a diagram

$$(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \xrightarrow{f} (\overline{Y}, M_{\overline{Y}}) \overset{\iota}{\hookrightarrow} (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}) \tag{4.1}$$

and a log pair $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}))$, where f is a morphism in (LS/B), $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ is an object in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ and ι is a closed immersion. In this situation, we define the notion of overconvergent isocrystals on $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}))/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$.

First let us assume that we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \arrow[r, "i"] \arrow[d, "f"'] & (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}) \arrow[d, "g"] \\
(\overline{Y}, M_{\overline{Y}}) \arrow[r, "\iota"] & (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}),
\end{tikzcd} \tag{4.2}$$

where i is a closed immersion and g is formally log smooth. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $(\mathcal{P}(n), M_{\mathcal{P}(n)})$ the $(n+1)$-fold fiber product of $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$. Then we have the projections

$$p_i :]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}(1)} \longrightarrow]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}} \ (i = 1, 2), \qquad p_{ij} :]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}(2)} \longrightarrow]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}(1)} \ (1 \leq i < j \leq 3)$$

and the diagonal $\Delta :]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}} \hookrightarrow]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}(1)}$. Then:

Definition 4.1. *With the above notation, the category* $I^{\dagger}(((X, \overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{P})^{\log})$ *of realization of overconvergent isocrystals on* $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}))/\mathcal{Y}_K$ *over* $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ *is defined to be the category of pairs* (E, ϵ)*, where* E *is a coherent* $j^{\dagger}\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}}$*-module and* ϵ *is a* $j^{\dagger}\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}(1)}}$*-linear isomorphism* $p_2^*E \xrightarrow{\sim} p_1^*E$ *satisfying* $\Delta^*(\epsilon) = \mathrm{id}, p_{12}^*(\epsilon) \circ p_{23}^*(\epsilon) = p_{13}^*(\epsilon)$. (E, ϵ) *is called locally free if* E *is a locally free* $j^{\dagger}\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}}$*-module.*

We give a slight generalization of the above definition as follows: Assume given a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \arrow[r, "i"] \arrow[d, "f"'] & (\mathfrak{P}, M_{\mathfrak{P}}) \arrow[d, "g"] \\
(\overline{Y}, M_{\overline{Y}}) \arrow[r, "\iota"] & (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}),
\end{tikzcd} \tag{4.3}$$

where $(\mathfrak{P}, M_{\mathfrak{P}})$ is (not necessarily p-adic) fine log formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme, i is a closed immersion, and g is a morphism in $(\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ satisfying the following condition $(*)$:

$(*)$ Zariski locally on $\mathfrak{P}$, there exists a diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \arrow[r, "i"] \arrow[d, "f"'] & (\mathfrak{P}, M_{\mathfrak{P}}) \arrow[r, "i'"] \arrow[d, "g"'] & (\widetilde{\mathfrak{P}}, M_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{P}}}) \arrow[d, "g'"'] \\
(\overline{Y}, M_{\overline{Y}}) \arrow[r, "\iota"] & (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}) \arrow[r, equal] & (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}),
\end{tikzcd} \tag{4.4}$$

where g' is a formally log smooth morphism in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$, i' is a morphism in $(\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ such that $i' \circ i$ is again a closed immersion such that i' induces the isomorphism $(\mathfrak{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathfrak{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}}) \xrightarrow{=} (\widetilde{\mathfrak{P}}^{\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{P}}^{\mathrm{ex}}})$, where ${}^{\mathrm{ex}}$ denotes the exactification of the closed immersion from $(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}})$.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $(\mathfrak{P}(n), M_{\mathfrak{P}(n)})$ the $(n+1)$-fold fiber product of $(\mathfrak{P}, M_{\mathfrak{P}})$

over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ and we denote $(\mathfrak{P}(n)^{\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathfrak{P}(n)^{\mathrm{ex}}})$ the exactification of $(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathfrak{P}(n), M_{\mathfrak{P}(n)})$. (So we have $\mathfrak{P}(0)^{\mathrm{ex}} = \mathfrak{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}$.) Let $\mathfrak{P}(n)^{\mathrm{ex}\prime}$ be the open sub formal scheme of $\mathfrak{P}(n)^{\mathrm{ex}}$ which is homeomorphic to X. Then, starting from the admissible open immersion ${\mathfrak{P}(n)^{\mathrm{ex}\prime}}_K \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{P}(n)^{\mathrm{ex}}_K$, we can define the structure sheaf of overconvergent sections $j^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{P}(n)^{\mathrm{ex}}_K}$. We also have the projections p_i, p_{ij} and the diagonal Δ between $\mathfrak{P}(n)^{\mathrm{ex}}$'s. Then we have the following generalization of Definition 4.1:

Definition 4.2. *With the above notation, the category $I^\dagger(((X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathfrak{P})^{\log})$ of realization of overconvergent isocrystals on $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}))/\mathcal{Y}_K$ over $(\mathfrak{P}, M_{\mathfrak{P}})$ is defined to be the category of pairs (E, ϵ), where E is a coherent $j^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K}$-module and ϵ is a $j^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{P}(1)^{\mathrm{ex}}_K}$-linear isomorphism $p_2^*E \xrightarrow{\sim} p_1^*E$ satisfying $\Delta^*(\epsilon) = \mathrm{id}, p_{12}^*(\epsilon)\circ p_{23}^*(\epsilon) = p_{13}^*(\epsilon)$.*

Note that, in the notation in Definition 4.2, we have the canonical equivalence of categories

$$I^\dagger(((X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}, \mathfrak{P})^{\log}) \cong I^\dagger(((X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}, \mathfrak{P}^{\mathrm{ex}})^{\log}).$$

Lemma 4.3. *With the notation in Definition 4.2, the category $I^\dagger(((X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}, \mathfrak{P})^{\log})$ satisfies the descent property for formally etale covering of $\mathfrak{P}$.*

Proof. We can prove this lemma in the same way as etale descent of the category of overconvergent isocrystals proved in [S3, 5.1]. The detail is left to the reader. □

Lemma 4.4. *With the notation in Definition 4.1, assume moreover that we are given the commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd} (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & (\mathcal{Q}, M_{\mathcal{Q}}) \arrow[d, "h"'] \\ (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \arrow[r, "i"] & (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}), \end{tikzcd} \tag{4.5}$$

where the top horizontal arrow is a closed immersion and h is a formally log smooth morphism in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$. Then the restriction functor

$$h^* : I^\dagger(((X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{P})^{\log}) \longrightarrow I^\dagger(((X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Q})^{\log})$$

is an equivalence of categories.

Proof. We may replace $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}), (\mathcal{Q}, M_{\mathcal{Q}})$ by $(\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}}), (\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{ex}}})$ to prove the lemma, and we may work Zariski locally on $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}$. So we may assume that $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}} = \operatorname{Spf} A$ is affine and the map $\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{ex}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}$ is given by the natural morphism $\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{ex}} = \operatorname{Spf} A[[t_1, \cdots, t_r]] \longrightarrow \operatorname{Spf} A = \mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}$. Let $s : \mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{ex}}$ be the map given by the closed immersion of $\operatorname{Spf} A$ into the origin of $\operatorname{Spf} A[[t_1, \cdots, t_r]]$. Then we have the functor $s^* : I^\dagger(((X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Q})^{\log}) \longrightarrow I^\dagger(((X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{P})^{\log})$ with $s^* \circ h^* = \mathrm{id}$. On the other hand, for any $(E, \epsilon) \in I^\dagger(((X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Q})^{\log})$, we have the isomorphism $\varphi_E : (h^* \circ s^*)(E) \longrightarrow E$ given by pulling back the isomorphism $\epsilon : p_2^*E \xrightarrow{\sim} p_1^*E$ by $(h \circ s, \mathrm{id})_K : \mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}(1)^{\mathrm{ex}}_K$. Since one can check easily the commutativity $\epsilon \circ p_2^*\varphi_E = p_1^*\varphi_E \circ (h^* \circ s^*)\epsilon$ and the functoriality of φ_E with respect to (E, ϵ), we see that φ_E's induce the isomorphism of functors $h^* \circ s^* \cong \mathrm{id}$. So h^* is an equivalence of categories. □

Now, let us go back to the situation (4.1) and let us define the category of overconvergent isocrystals on $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}))/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ in general case, that is, the case where we do not necessarily have the diagram (4.2). In this case, we have an embedding system

$$(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \xleftarrow{g} (\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}}) \overset{i^{(\bullet)}}{\hookrightarrow} (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}) \tag{4.6}$$

over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$. Let us put $(X^{(\bullet)}, M_{X^{(\bullet)}}) := (X, M_X) \times_{(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}})} (\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}})$. Then, we denote by $I^\dagger(((X^{(\bullet)}, \overline{X}^{(\bullet)})/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)})^{\log})$ the category of descent data with respect to $I^\dagger(((X^{(n)}, \overline{X}^{(n)})/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{P}^{(n)})^{\log})$ $(n = 0, 1, 2)$. Then we have the following:

Lemma 4.5. *With the above notation, the category* $I^\dagger(((X^{(\bullet)}, \overline{X}^{(\bullet)})/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)})^{\log})$ *is independent of the choice of the embedding system.*

Proof. By standard argument, we are reduced to showing the following claim: Assume we are given the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}}) \arrow[r, "i^{(\bullet)}"] \arrow[d, "g"'] & (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}) \arrow[d, "h"'] \\
(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \arrow[r, "i"] & (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}),
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $i^{(\bullet)}, g$ are as in (4.6), h is a formally log smooth morphism in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$, i is a closed immersion and $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ is a p-adic fine log formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme formally log smooth over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$. Then the restriction functor

$$h^* : I^\dagger(((X, \overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{P})^{\log}) \longrightarrow I^\dagger(((X^{(\bullet)}, \overline{X}^{(\bullet)})/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)})^{\log})$$

gives an equivalence of categories. (Here $I^\dagger(((X^{(\bullet)}, \overline{X}^{(\bullet)})/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)})^{\log})$ denotes the category of descent data with respect to $I^\dagger(((X^{(n)}, \overline{X}^{(n)})/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{P}^{(n)})^{\log})$ $(n = 0, 1, 2)$.) We prove this claim. Let $(\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}})$ be the exactification of i and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)}})$ be the unique fine log formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme strict formally etale over $(\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}})$ satisfying $(\overline{X}^{(n)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(n)}}) = (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \times_{(\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}})} (\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)}})$. Then, by Lemma 4.3, we have the equivalence

$$I^\dagger(((X, \overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{P})^{\log}) \cong I^\dagger(((X^{(\bullet)}, \overline{X}^{(\bullet)})/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(\bullet)})^{\log}).$$

(Here $I^\dagger(((X^{(\bullet)}, \overline{X}^{(\bullet)})/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(\bullet)})^{\log})$ denotes the category of descent data with respect to $I^\dagger(((X^{(n)}, \overline{X}^{(n)})/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)})^{\log})$ $(n = 0, 1, 2)$.) On the other hand, let $(\mathcal{P}^{(n),\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(n),\mathrm{ex}}})$ be the exactification of $i^{(n)}$. Then we have the morphism

$$h^{(n)} : (\mathcal{P}^{(n),\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(n),\mathrm{ex}}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)}})$$

induced by h. Then, it suffices to prove that the restriction functor

$$h^{(n),*} : I^\dagger(((X^{(n)}, \overline{X}^{(n)})/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)})^{\log}) \longrightarrow I^\dagger(((X^{(n)}, \overline{X}^{(n)})/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{P}^{(n),\mathrm{ex}})^{\log})$$

gives an equivalence of categories. Let $((\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)}}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y},M_{\mathcal{Y}})} (\mathcal{P}^{(n),\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(n),\mathrm{ex}}}))^{\mathrm{ex}}$ be the exactification of the closed immersion

$$(\overline{X}^{(n)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(n)}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)}}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y},M_{\mathcal{Y}})} (\mathcal{P}^{(n),\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(n),\mathrm{ex}}}).$$

Let

$$p_i : ((\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)}}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y},M_{\mathcal{Y}})} (\mathcal{P}^{(n),\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(n),\mathrm{ex}}}))^{\mathrm{ex}} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)}}) \quad (i = 1, 2)$$

be the morphism induced by projections and let

$$\gamma : (\mathcal{P}^{(n),\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(n),\mathrm{ex}}}) \longrightarrow ((\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)}}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y},M_{\mathcal{Y}})} (\mathcal{P}^{(n),\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(n),\mathrm{ex}}}))^{\mathrm{ex}}$$

be the morphism induced by the graph of $h^{(n)}$. Then the restriction functor $h^{(n),*}$ is written as the composite $\gamma^* \circ p_1^*$. Note now that the fine log formal $\mathcal{B}$-schemes $(\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)}}), (\mathcal{P}^{(n),\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(n),\mathrm{ex}}})$ are obtained Zariski locally as the exactification of some p-adic fine log formal $\mathcal{B}$-schemes which are formally log smooth over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$. (It is clear in the case of $(\mathcal{P}^{(n),\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(n),\mathrm{ex}}})$ and in the case $(\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex},(n)}})$, this follows from [S2, claim in p.81].) So the morphisms p_i $(i = 1, 2)$ are obtained, via taking exactification, from formally log smooth morphisms (projections) between p-adic fine log formal $\mathcal{B}$-schemes which are formally log smooth over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$. So, by Lemma 4.4, the restriction functors p_i^* $(i = 1, 2)$ are equivalences. On the other hand, since γ is a section of p_2, we see that the functors p_2^* and γ^* are the inverse of each other. (The proof is the same as the proof in Lemma 4.4.) So the functor γ^* is also an equivalence. So $h^{(n),*} = \gamma^* \circ p_1^*$ is an equivalence of categories. So we are done. □

So we can define the category of overconvergent isocrystals as follows:

Definition 4.6. *Let us assume given the diagram* (4.1) *and take an embedding system* (4.6). *Then we define the category* $I^\dagger(((X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y})^{\log})$ *of overconvergent isocrystals on* $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}))/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ *by* $I^\dagger(((X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y})^{\log}) := I^\dagger(((X^{(\bullet)}, \overline{X}^{(\bullet)})/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)})^{\log})$. (*By Lemma 4.5, this is independent of the choice of the embedding system.*)

Let us assume given a diagram (4.1) and a log pair $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}))$. Assume moreover for the moment that we have the commutative diagram (4.2). Then, for an object $\mathcal{E} := (E, \epsilon)$ in $I^\dagger(((X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}_K)^{\log}) = I^\dagger(((X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{P})^{\log})$, we can naturally define the log de Rham complex of the form

$$E \longrightarrow E \otimes_{j^\dagger \mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}}} j^\dagger \omega^1_{]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}/\mathcal{Y}_K} \longrightarrow E \otimes_{j^\dagger \mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}}} j^\dagger \omega^2_{]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}/\mathcal{Y}_K} \longrightarrow \cdots$$

(where $\omega^i_{]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}/\mathcal{Y}_K}$ is the restriction of $\mathbb{Q} \otimes \omega^i_{\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Y}} \in \mathrm{Coh}(\mathbb{Q} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}}) \cong \mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{P}_K)$ to $]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$) on $]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$, which we denote by $\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E})$.

In the case where we have the diagram (4.3) (satisfying the condition $(*)$) instead of the diagram (4.2), we also have a similar log de Rham complex on $\mathfrak{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K$, which we denote by $\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(\mathfrak{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E})$.

Now let us assume given the diagram (4.1) and log pairs $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}))$, $((Y, M_Y), (\overline{Y}, M_{\overline{Y}}))$ satisfying $f(X) \subseteq Y$ and an overconvegent isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ on $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}))/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$. Let us take the embedding system (4.6) and denote the morphism $]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}} \longrightarrow]\overline{Y}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ by h. Then we define $Rf_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E}$, $R^q f_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} Rf_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E} &:= Rh_*\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}), \\ R^q f_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E} &:= R^q h_*\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}) \end{aligned}$$

and we call $R^q f_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E}$ the q-th relative log rigid cohomology. (It is an $j^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{Y}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Y}}}$-module.) Then we have the following:

Proposition 4.7. *The above definition is independent of the choice of the embedding system.*

Before the proof of Proposition 4.7, we prove a lemma:

Lemma 4.8. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a (not necessarily p-adic) affine fine log formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme and let $g_1, \cdots, g_c$ be elements of $\Gamma(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}})$. For $\nu \in p^{\mathbb{Q}_{<0}}$, let U_ν be the admissible open set $\bigcup_{i=1}^c \{|g_i| \geq \nu\}$ of $\mathcal{P}_K$. Then, for any affinoid admissible open set W of $\mathcal{P}_K$ admits an affinoid admissible open covering $W = \bigcup_{i=0}^c W_i$ such that $W_i \cap U_\nu$ is affinoid for any ν sufficiently close to 1 and for any $0 \leq i \leq c$.*

Proof. For $\nu \in p^{\mathbb{Q}_{<0}}$ and $1 \leq i \leq c$, define $U_{\nu,i}$ to be the admissible open set $\{|g_i| \geq \nu, |g_i| \geq |g_j|\, (\forall j \neq i)\}$ of $\mathcal{P}_K$ and define $U_{\nu,0}$ to be the admissible open set $\{|g_j| \leq \nu\, (\forall j)\}$. Then $\mathcal{P}_K = \bigcup_{i=0}^c U_{\nu,i}$ is an admissible covering. If we fix $\nu_0 \in p^{\mathbb{Q}_{<0}}$ and put $W_i := W \cap U_{\nu_0,i}$, we obtain the admissible covering $W = \bigcup_{i=0}^c W_i$ by affinoid subsets. Moreover, for $\nu > \nu_0$, we have $W_0 \cap U_\nu = \emptyset$ and for $1 \leq i \leq c$, $W_i \cap U_\nu = W \cap U_{\nu,i}$ is affinoid. So we are done. □

Proof of Proposition 4.7. The proof is similar to [S3, 4.3] and the case without log structures ([Ch-T, 8.3.5], see also [B4, 1.4]). By looking at carefully the proof of [S3, 4.3], we see that it suffices to prove the following two claims (cf. [S3, 4.4, 4.5]):

claim 1. Assume we are given a Cartesian diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} (\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}) \arrow[d, "g"'] \\ (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \arrow[r, "\iota"] & (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}), \end{tikzcd} \tag{4.7}$$

where $(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}})$ is as above, $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ is an object in (LFS/$\mathcal{B}$), ι is a closed immersion and g is a strict etale hypercovering. Let $g_K :]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}} \longrightarrow]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$ be the morphism induced by g and let $\mathcal{E}$ be a coherent $j^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}}$-module. Then we have the isomorphism

$$\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{=} Rg_{K,*}g_K^*\mathcal{E}.$$

claim 2. Assume we are given a diagram over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \arrow[r, "\iota_1"] \arrow[d, equal] & (\mathcal{Q}, M_{\mathcal{Q}}) \arrow[d, "g"'] \\
(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \arrow[r, "\iota_2"] & (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}),
\end{tikzcd} \tag{4.8}$$

where $(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}})$ is as above, $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}), (\mathcal{Q}, M_{\mathcal{Q}})$ are objects in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$, ι_1, ι_2 are closed immersions and g is a formally log smooth morphism. Let $g_K :]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Q}} \longrightarrow]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$ be the morphism induced by g. Then we have a quasi-isomorphism

$$\mathrm{DR}^{\dagger}(]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}) \xrightarrow{=} Rg_{K,*}\mathrm{DR}^{\dagger}(]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Q}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}).$$

The proof of claim 1 can be reduced to the case where ι is a homeomorphic exact closed immersion into a p-adic fine log formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme (see the proof of [S3, 4.4]) and in this case, the claim is a special case of the etale cohomological descent of Chiarellotto-Tsuzuki ([Ch-T, 7.1.2]).

Let us prove the claim 2. We may work Zariski locally on $\mathcal{P}$. Let $(\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{ex}}}), (\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}})$ be the exactification of ι_1, ι_2, respectively. Since we may work Zariski locally on $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}$, we may assume that $\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K \times D^r$ and the morphism g_K is equal to the projection $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K \times D^r \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K$. Let $(t_1, \cdots, t_r)$ be the coordinate of D^r and let $\Omega^{\bullet}$ be the complex

$$[\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K} \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K} dt_i \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq r} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K} dt_{i_1} \wedge dt_{i_2} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K} dt_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dt_r].$$

Then $\mathrm{DR}^{\dagger}(]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Q}}/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ is equal to the total complex associated to the double complex $g_K^*\mathrm{DR}^{\dagger}(]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K}} \Omega^{\bullet}$. So, to prove the lemma, it suffices to prove the quasi-isomorphism

$$E \xrightarrow{\simeq} Rg_{K,*}(g_K^* E \otimes \Omega^{\bullet}) \tag{4.9}$$

for any coherent $j_X^{\dagger}\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K}$-module E. Moreover, to prove the quasi-isomorphism (4.9), we can reduce to the case $r = 1$ by induction. So we may assume $r = 1$. Let $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_c \in \Gamma(\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}})$ be a lift of generators of $\mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma(\overline{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}}) \to \Gamma(\overline{X} - X, \mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}-X})$ and for $\nu \in p^{\mathbb{Q}_{<0}}$, let U_{ν} be the admissible open subset $\bigcup_{i=1}^{c}\{|\alpha_i| \geq \nu\}$ in $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K$. To prove the quasi-isomorphism (4.9), it suffices to check it on sufficiently small affinoid admissible open subset of $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K$. So it suffices to check on an affinoid admissible open subset W of $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K$ such that $W_{\nu} := W \cap U_{\nu}$ is also affinoid for any ν sufficiently close to 1, by Lemma 4.8. For $\lambda, \nu \in p^{\mathbb{Q}_{<0}}$, let $g_K^{-1}(W)_{\lambda,\nu}$ be the affinoid admissible open set $\{|t_1| \leq \lambda\} \cap g_K^{-1}(W_{\nu})$ of $g_K^{-1}(W)$. When ν is sufficiently close to 1, E is obtained from a coherent $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K}$-module on W_{ν}, which we denote by E_{ν}. Then we have

$$\Gamma(W, E) = \varinjlim_{\nu \to 1} \Gamma(W_{\nu}, E_{\nu}),$$

$$R\Gamma(g_K^{-1}(W), g_K^* E \otimes \Omega^{\bullet}) = R\varprojlim_{\lambda \to 1} \varinjlim_{\nu \to 1} \Gamma(g_K^{-1}(W)_{\lambda,\nu}, g_K^* E_{\nu} \otimes \Omega^{\bullet}).$$

So, to prove the quasi-isomorphism (4.9), it suffices to prove the following claim:

claim 3. Under the above situation,
(1) The complex

$$\begin{aligned}0 \to \varinjlim_{\nu\to 1}\Gamma(W_\nu, E_\nu) \to \varprojlim_{\lambda\to 1}\varinjlim_{\nu\to 1}\Gamma(g_K^{-1}(W)_{\lambda,\nu}, g_K^* E_\nu) \\ \xrightarrow{d} \varprojlim_{\lambda\to 1}\varinjlim_{\nu\to 1}\Gamma(g_K^{-1}(W)_{\lambda,\nu}, g_K^* E_\nu \otimes \Omega^1) \to 0\end{aligned}$$

is exact.
(2) The map

$$R^1\varprojlim_{\lambda\to 1}\varinjlim_{\nu\to 1}\Gamma(g_K^{-1}(W)_{\lambda,\nu}, g_K^* E_\nu) \longrightarrow R^1\varprojlim_{\lambda\to 1}\varinjlim_{\nu\to 1}\Gamma(g_K^{-1}(W)_{\lambda,\nu}, g_K^* E_\nu \otimes \Omega^1)$$

is an isomorphism.

To prove claim 3, note first that we have

$$\Gamma(g_K^{-1}(W)_{\lambda,\nu}, g_K^* E_\nu) = \{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n t_1^n \mid a_n \in \Gamma(W_\nu, E_\nu), |a_n|\lambda^n \to 0\},$$

where $|-|$ denotes the Banach norm on $\Gamma(W_\nu, E_\nu)$, and similar description holds also for $\Gamma(g_K^{-1}(W)_{\lambda,\nu}, g_K^* E_\nu \otimes \Omega^1)$. Then, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n t_1^n \in \Gamma(g_K^{-1}(W)_{\lambda,\nu}, g_K^* E_\nu)$ is sent to zero by d if and only if $a_n = 0$ for $n > 0$, and for any $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n t_1^n dt_1 \in \Gamma(g_K^{-1}(W)_{\lambda,\nu}, g_K^* E_\nu \otimes \Omega^1)$, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(a_n/(n+1))t_1^{n+1}$ is contained in $\Gamma(g_K^{-1}(W)_{\lambda',\nu}, g_K^* E_\nu)$ for any $\lambda' < \lambda$. From these facts, we see claim 3 (1). Claim 3 (2) can be shown as [B4, Thm 1.4], using claim 3 (1). So we are done. □

Remark 4.9. The final step of the proof of [Ch-T, Prop 8.3.5] is incomplete, because claim 3 (2) is omitted in their proof.

By Proposition 4.7, we see that $Rf_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E}$, $R^q f_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E}$ are well-defined.

We introduce another construction of relative log rigid cohomology in log smooth case. Assume given the diagram (4.1) and log pairs $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}))$, $((Y, M_Y), (\overline{Y}, M_{\overline{Y}}))$ Assume moreover that f is log smooth. Then we have an open covering $\overline{X} = \bigcup_{j\in J}\overline{X}_j$ by finite number of affine subschemes and exact closed immersions $i_j : (\overline{X}_j, M_{\overline{X}_j}) := (\overline{X}_j, M_{\overline{X}}|_{X_j}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}_j, M_{\mathcal{P}_j})\,(j \in J)$ into a fine log formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme $(\mathcal{P}_j, M_{\mathcal{P}_j})$ formally log smooth over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ such that each $\mathcal{P}_j$ is affine and $(\mathcal{P}_j, M_{\mathcal{P}_j}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y},M_{\mathcal{Y}})} (\overline{Y}, M_{\overline{Y}}) = (\overline{X}_j, M_{\overline{X}_j})$ holds. For any non-empty subset $L \subseteq J$, let $(\overline{X}_L, M_{\overline{X}_L})$ (resp. $(\mathcal{P}_L, M_{\mathcal{P}_L})$) be the fiber product of $(\overline{X}_j, M_{\overline{X}_j})$'s (resp. $(\mathcal{P}_j, M_{\mathcal{P}_j})$'s) for $j \in L$ over $(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}})$ (resp. $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$), and for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(\overline{X}^{(m)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(m)}})$ (resp. $(\mathcal{P}^{(m)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(m)}})$) be the disjoint union of $(\overline{X}_L, M_{\overline{X}_L})$'s (resp. $(\mathcal{P}_L, M_{\mathcal{P}_L})$'s) for $L \subseteq J$ with $|L| = m + 1$. Note that if m is equal to or greater than $|J| =: N + 1$, $\overline{X}^{(m)}$ is empty. Now let Δ_N^+ be the category such that the objects are the sets $[m] := \{0, 1, 2, \cdots m\}$ with $m \leq N$ and that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\Delta_N^+}([m], [m'])$ is the set of strictly increasing maps $[m] \to [m']$. Then, if we fix a total order on the set J, $(\overline{X}^{(m)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(m)}})$'s and $(\mathcal{P}^{(m)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(m)}})$'s $(m \leq N)$ naturally form diagrams $(\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}}), (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}})$ indexed by the category Δ_N^+. (It is not a truncated simplicial object since it does not have degeneracy maps.) Then we have a canonical diagram

$$(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \xleftarrow{g^{(\bullet)}} (\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}) \tag{4.10}$$

over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$. Then, for an overconvergent isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ on $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}))/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$, we have the log de Rham complex $\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E})$. Let us denote the morphism $]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}} \longrightarrow]\overline{Y}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ by h. Then we have the following:

Proposition 4.10. *With the above notation, we have the quasi-isomorphism*

$$Rh_*\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}) = Rf_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E}.$$

Proof. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(\widetilde{X}^{(m)}, M_{\widetilde{X}^{(m)}})$ (resp. $(\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^{(m)}, M_{\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^{(m)}})$) be the $(m+1)$-fold fiber product of $(\overline{X}^{(0)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(0)}})$ (resp. $(\mathcal{P}^{(0)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(0)}})$) over $(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}})$ (resp. $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$). Then we have the embedding system

$$(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \longleftarrow (\widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)}}) \hookrightarrow (\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^{(\bullet)}})$$

and each $(\overline{X}^{(m)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(m)}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}^{(m)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(m)}})$ is contained as a direct summand in $(\widetilde{X}^{(m)}, M_{\widetilde{X}^{(m)}}) \hookrightarrow (\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^{(m)}, M_{\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^{(m)}})$ in a compatible way with respect to m (indexed by Δ_N^+). So, if we denote the morphism $]\widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}} \longrightarrow]\overline{Y}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ by $\widetilde{h}$, we have the homomorphism

$$Rf_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E} = R\widetilde{h}_*\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}) \longrightarrow Rh_*\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}).$$

We will prove that it is a quasi-isomorphism.

Note that the above homorphism gives the homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned}&[(R^t\widetilde{h}_*\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\widetilde{X}^{(s)}[^{\log}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^{(s)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}) \;\Rightarrow\; R^{s+t}\widetilde{h}_*\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E})] \\ \longrightarrow\; &[(R^th_*\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}^{(s)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(s)}}/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \;\Rightarrow\; Rh_*\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})]\end{aligned}$$

of spectral sequences. So it suffices to prove that the homomorphism

$$\alpha : R^t\widetilde{h}_*\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}) \longrightarrow R^th_*\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$$

between the complex of $E_1^{\bullet,t}$-terms is a quasi-isomorphism. To prove this, it suffices to prove that the homomorphism

$$\Gamma(U, \alpha) : \Gamma(U, R^t\widetilde{h}_*\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E})) \longrightarrow \Gamma(U, R^th_*\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}))$$

is a quasi-isomorphism for any admissible open set $U \subseteq]\overline{Y}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Y}}$. Let T_J be the topological space whose underlying set is the set of non-empty subsets of J and whose open sets are the sets of the form $O(L) := \{L' \subseteq J \mid L' \supseteq L\}$ $(\emptyset \neq L \subseteq J)$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the presheaf on T_J given by

$$\mathcal{F}(O(L)) := \Gamma(U, R^th_L * \mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}_L[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_L}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E})),$$

(where h_L is the morphism $]\overline{X}_L[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_L} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Y}_K$), and let us denote the open covering $T_J = \bigcup_{j \in J} O(\{j\})$ by $\mathcal{T}$. Then $\Gamma(U, R^t\widetilde{h}_*\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\widetilde{\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}))$ is nothing but the Čech complex $C^\bullet(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ of $\mathcal{F}$ associated to $\mathcal{T}$, $\Gamma(U, R^t h_*\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}))$ is nothing but the Čech complex consisting of alternating cochains $\overline{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ of $\mathcal{F}$ and $\Gamma(U, \alpha)$ is the canonical homomorphism $C^\bullet(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F}) \longrightarrow \overline{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$. It is well-known that this homomorphism is a quasi-isomorphism. So we are done. □

Next we prove a relation between relative log rigid cohomology and relative rigid cohomology in special case. (Part of the content here seems to be essentially appeared in [S3, §5]. But here we give it in a more systematic, simple way.)

To do this, first we give a preliminary result concerning coherent modules on rigid analytic spaces and overconvergent isocrystals. Let us assume given morphisms

$$j_X : X \hookrightarrow \overline{X}, \;\; i : (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}),$$

where j_X is an open immersion of B-schemes and i is a closed immersion from a fine log B-scheme to a p-adic fine log formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme such that $X \subseteq (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})_{\mathrm{triv}}$ holds. Under this condition, let us first define the category $\widetilde{\mathrm{Coh}}(\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[_{\mathcal{P}}})$ as follows: An object in this category is a pair (U, E), where U is a strict neighborhood of $]X[_{\mathcal{P}}$ in $]\overline{X}[_{\mathcal{P}}$ and E is a coherent $\mathcal{O}_U$-module. For objects $(U, E), (U', E')$, the set of morphisms is defined by $\mathrm{Hom}((U, E), (U', E')) := \varinjlim_V \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_V}(E|_V, E'|_V)$, where V runs through the set of strict neighborhoods of $]X[_{\mathcal{P}}$ in $]\overline{X}[_{\mathcal{P}}$ contained in $U \cap U'$. By [B3, (2.1.10)], we have the equivalence of categories

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{Coh}}(\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[_{\mathcal{P}}}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Coh}(j_X^\dagger \mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[_{\mathcal{P}}})$$

which is given by $(U, E) \mapsto j_U^\dagger E := \varinjlim_V \alpha_{V]\overline{X}[_{\mathcal{P}},*} \alpha_{VU}^{-1} E$, where V runs through the set of strict neighborhoods of $]X[_{\mathcal{P}}$ in $]\overline{X}[_{\mathcal{P}}$ contained in U and $\alpha_{V?}$ denotes the admissible open immersion $V \hookrightarrow ?$. On the other hand, let us define the category $\widetilde{\mathrm{Coh}}(\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}})$ as follows: An object in this category is a pair (U, E), where U is a strict neighborhood of $]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}} =]X[_{\mathcal{P}}$ in $]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$ and E is a coherent $\mathcal{O}_U$-module. For objects $(U, E), (U', E')$, the set of morphisms is defined by $\mathrm{Hom}((U, E), (U', E')) := \varinjlim_V \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_V}(E|_V, E'|_V)$, where V runs through the set of strict neighborhoods of $]X[_{\mathcal{P}}$ in $]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$ contained in $U \cap U'$. Then, by the same argument as [B3, (2.1.10)], we see the equivalence of categories

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{Coh}}(\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Coh}(j_X^\dagger \mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}}).$$

Let us denote the morphism $]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}} \longrightarrow]\overline{X}[_{\mathcal{P}}$ by φ_X. Then we have the following:

Proposition 4.11. *With the above notation,*

1. *The restriction functor* $\varphi_X^* : \mathrm{Coh}(j_X^\dagger \mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[_{\mathcal{P}}}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Coh}(j_X^\dagger \mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}})$ *is an equivalence of categories.*

(2) *We have* $R\varphi_{X,*}\varphi_X^*E = E$ *for any* $E \in \mathrm{Coh}(j_X^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[_{\mathcal{P}}})$. (*Consequently, the functor* $\varphi_{X,*}$ *sends* $\mathrm{Coh}(j_X^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}})$ *to* $\mathrm{Coh}(j_X^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[_{\mathcal{P}}})$ *and the resulting functor*

$$\varphi_{X,*} : \mathrm{Coh}(j_X^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Coh}(j_X^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[_{\mathcal{P}}})$$

is the exact functor which is the inverse of the functor φ_X^*).

Proof. First we prove the assertion (1). To prove it, it suffices to prove the restriction functor $\varphi_X^* : \widetilde{\mathrm{Coh}}(\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[_{\mathcal{P}}}) \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathrm{Coh}}(\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}})$ is an equivalence of categories. Let us take a Cartesian diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}}) \arrow[r, "i^{(\bullet)}"] \arrow[d] & (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}) \arrow[d, "g"] \\
(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \arrow[r, "i"] & (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})
\end{tikzcd} \tag{4.11}$$

such that g is a strict formally etale Čech hypercovering and for each n, $i^{(n)}$ admits a factorization

$$(\overline{X}^{(n)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(n)}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}'^{(n)}, M_{\mathcal{P}'^{(n)}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{P}^{(n)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}}),$$

where the first map is an exact closed immersion and the second map is formally log etale. Put $X^{(n)} := X \times_{\overline{X}} \overline{X}^{(n)}$, and let $\widetilde{\mathrm{Coh}}(\mathcal{O}_{]X^{(\bullet)}[_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}}), \widetilde{\mathrm{Coh}}(\mathcal{O}_{]X^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}})$ be the category of descent data with respect to $\widetilde{\mathrm{Coh}}(\mathcal{O}_{]X^{(n)}[_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}}})$ $(n = 0, 1, 2)$, $\widetilde{\mathrm{Coh}}(\mathcal{O}_{]X^{(n)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}}})$ $(n = 0, 1, 2)$, respectively.

Then, by [S3, 5.8], the natural map $]\overline{X}^{(n)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}} \longrightarrow]\overline{X}^{(n)}[_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}}$ induces an isomorphism between some strict neighborhood of $]X^{(n)}[_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}}$ in $]\overline{X}^{(n)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}}$ and some strict neighborhood of $]X^{(n)}[_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}}$ in $]\overline{X}^{(n)}[_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}}$ (for each n). Therefore, the restriction functor $\widetilde{\mathrm{Coh}}(\mathcal{O}_{]X^{(\bullet)}[_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}}) \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathrm{Coh}}(\mathcal{O}_{]X^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}})$ is an equivalence of categories. On the other hand, for any family of strict neighborhoods $\{U^{(n)}\}_{n=0,1,2}$ of $]X^{(n)}[_{\mathcal{P}}$ in $]\overline{X}^{(n)}[_{\mathcal{P}}$ (resp. $]\overline{X}^{(n)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$), there exists a strict neighborhood U of $]X[_{\mathcal{P}}$ in $]\overline{X}[_{\mathcal{P}}$ (resp. $]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$) such that the pull-back of U in $]\overline{X}^{(n)}[_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}}$ (resp. $]\overline{X}^{(n)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}}$) is contained in $U^{(n)}$ (for $n = 0, 1, 2$). (This follows from the fact that the diagram (4.11) is Cartesian and the definition of $X^{(\bullet)}$.) So we can shrink $\{U^{(n)}\}_{n=0,1,2}$ so that they are the pull-back of U. Then the morphism $U^{(\bullet)} \longrightarrow U$ satisfies the following property: For any affinoid admissible open set $V = \mathrm{Spm}\,(\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} A) \subseteq U$, the morphism $V^{(\bullet)} := V \times_U U^{(\bullet)} \longrightarrow V$ is induced from a etale Čech covering of $\mathrm{Spf}\, A$. So, by rigid analytic faifully flat descent, the restriction functor $\mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{O}_U) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{O}_{U^{(\bullet)}})$ is an equivalence of categories. This implies that the restriction functors

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{Coh}}(\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[_{\mathcal{P}}}) \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathrm{Coh}}(\mathcal{O}_{]X^{(\bullet)}[_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}}), \ \ \widetilde{\mathrm{Coh}}(\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}}) \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathrm{Coh}}(\mathcal{O}_{]X^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}})$$

are equivalence of categories. Since φ_X^* can be factorized as

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{Coh}}(\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[_{\mathcal{P}}}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \widetilde{\mathrm{Coh}}(\mathcal{O}_{]X^{(\bullet)}[_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \widetilde{\mathrm{Coh}}(\mathcal{O}_{]X^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}}) \xleftarrow{\simeq} \widetilde{\mathrm{Coh}}(\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}})$$

(where each arrows are defined by restriction), we can conclude that it is an equivalence of categories.

Next we prove the assertion (2). Let us denote the morphisms $]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}} \longrightarrow\,]\overline{X}[_{\mathcal{P}},]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}} \longrightarrow\,]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}},]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}} \longrightarrow\,]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}$ by $\pi, \pi^{\log}, \varphi_{X^{(\bullet)}}$ respectively. First we claim that, for a coherent module E on $]\overline{X}[_{\mathcal{P}},]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}},]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}$ respectively, we have $R\pi_*\pi^*E = E, R\pi^{\log}_*\pi^{\log,*}E = E, R\varphi_{X^{(\bullet)},*}\varphi^*_{X^{(\bullet)}}E = E$ respectively: In the case of π, it follows from [Ch-T, 7.3.1]. In the case of $\varphi_{X^{(\bullet)}}$, it follows from [Ch-T, 8.3.5], because $]\overline{X}^{(n)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}} =]\overline{X}^{(n)}[_{\mathcal{P}'^{(n)}}$ holds and $\mathcal{P}'^{(n)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}^{(n)}$ is isomorphic on a neighborhood of $X^{(n)}$. In the case of $\pi^{\log}$, let us denote the system of universal enlargements of $((\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}))$ by $\{(T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}), M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})}), (\overline{X}_{a,b}, M_{\overline{X}_{a,b}}))\}_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}}$. Then we have $]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}} = \bigcup T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})_K = \bigcup]\overline{X}_{a,b}[_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})}$. So it suffices to check the claim after pulling back the diagram (4.11) by $(T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}), M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$, and in this case, the claim follows from [Ch-T, 7.3.1] because we do not need to consider the log structure (since $(\overline{X}_{a,b}, M_{\overline{X}_{a,b}}) \hookrightarrow (T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}), M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})})$ is now an exact closed immersion).

By the claim in the previous paragraph, we have the following equality for a coherent $j^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}[_{\mathcal{P}}}$-module E:

$$R\varphi_{X,*}\varphi_X^*E = R\varphi_{X,*}R\pi^{\log}_*\pi^{\log,*}\varphi^*_XE = R\pi_*R\varphi_{X^{(\bullet)},*}\varphi^*_{X^{(\bullet)}}\pi^*E = E.$$

So we are done. □

Next let us assume given a diagram (4.1) and open immersions $j_X : X \hookrightarrow \overline{X}, j_Y : Y \hookrightarrow \overline{Y}$ such that $f(X) \subseteq Y$, $X \subseteq (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}})_{\mathrm{triv}}$ and $Y \subseteq (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})_{\mathrm{triv}}$ holds. Then there exists an embedding system

$$(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \longleftarrow (\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}})$$

such that, if we put $X^{(\bullet)} := X \times_{\overline{X}} \overline{X}^{(\bullet)}$, $X^{(\bullet)} \subseteq (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}})_{\mathrm{triv}}$ holds. (Hence $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}$ is formally smooth over $\mathcal{Y}$ on a neighborhood of $X^{(n)}$.) Then we have the category of overconvergent isocrystals $I^\dagger((X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}_K) = I^\dagger((X^{(\bullet)}, \overline{X}^{(\bullet)})/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)})$ on usual pairs defined in [Ch-T] and the category of overconvergent isocrystals $I^\dagger(((X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}_K)^{\log}) = I^\dagger(((X^{(\bullet)}, \overline{X}^{(\bullet)})/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)})^{\log})$ on log pairs defined in this section. Let us denote the morphism $]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}} \longrightarrow\,]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}},]\overline{Y}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Y}} \longrightarrow\,]\overline{Y}[_{\mathcal{Y}},]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}} \longrightarrow\,]\overline{Y}[_{\mathcal{Y}},]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}} \longrightarrow\,]\overline{Y}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ by $\varphi_X, \varphi_Y, h, h^{\log}$, respectively. Then we have the following:

Proposition 4.12. *Under the above assumption,*

(1) *The restriction functor*

$$I^\dagger((X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}_K) = I^\dagger((X^{(\bullet)}, \overline{X}^{(\bullet)})/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}) \xrightarrow{\varphi_X^*} I^\dagger(((X^{(\bullet)}, \overline{X}^{(\bullet)})/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)})^{\log}) = I^\dagger(((X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}_K)^{\log})$$

is an equivalence of categories.

(2) *For $\mathcal{E} \in I^\dagger((X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}_K) = I^\dagger(((X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}_K)^{\log})$, we have the quasi-isomorphisms*

$$\varphi_X^*\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}) = \mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}),$$

$$\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}) = \varphi_{X,*}\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}) = R\varphi_{X,*}\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}).$$

Proof. The assertion (1) follows easily from Proposition 4.11 (1) and the assertion (2) follows from Proposition 4.11 (2). □

As a corollary of Proposition 4.12, we have the quasi-isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} Rf_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E} &= Rh_*\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K,\mathcal{E}) \\ &= R\varphi_{Y,*}Rh^{\log}_*\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K,\mathcal{E}) \\ &= R\varphi_{Y,*}Rf_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}_K,\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E}. \end{aligned}$$

So we have the following theorem, which we will use in the following section:

Theorem 4.13. *Let the notations be as above. Then, if the relative log rigid cohomologies* $R^qf_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E}$ *are coherent* $j^\dagger_Y\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{Y}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Y}}}$*-modules for any* $q\geq 0$*, the relative rigid cohomologies* $R^qf_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}$ *are coherent* $j^\dagger_Y\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{Y}[_{\mathcal{Y}}}$*-modules for any* $q\geq 0$ *and we have the isomorphism* $R^qf_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E} = \varphi_{Y,*}R^qf_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E}$.

Next we introduce the notion of λ-restriction of relative log rigid cohomology and compare it to relative log rigid cohomology. Let us fix $\lambda\in(0,1)$, let us assume given the diagram (4.1) and log pairs $((X,M_X),(\overline{X},M_{\overline{X}}))$, $((Y,M_Y),(\overline{Y},M_{\overline{Y}}))$ satisfying $f(X)\subseteq Y$, and let us assume given an overconvegent isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ on $((X,M_X),(\overline{X},M_{\overline{X}}))/\mathcal{Y}$. First, assume for the moment that we have the diagram (4.2). Then we have the log de Rham complex $\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}/\mathcal{Y}_K,\mathcal{E})$. Then we can see the following in the same way as [B3, (2.2.3)]: For any sufficiently small strict neighborhood V of $]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$ in $]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$, there exists a log de Rham complex $\mathrm{DR}(V/\mathcal{Y}_K,\mathcal{E})$ consisting of coherent $\mathcal{O}_V$-modules which is compatible with respect to V and satisfies

$$\mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}/\mathcal{Y}_K,\mathcal{E}) = \varinjlim_V \alpha_{V,*}\mathrm{DR}(V/\mathcal{Y}_K,\mathcal{E}),$$

where α_V is the admissible open immersion $V\hookrightarrow]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$. Let us put $V_\lambda := V\cap\,]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}$, let us denote the composite $V_\lambda\hookrightarrow V\overset{\alpha_V}{\hookrightarrow}]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$ by $j_{V,\lambda}$ and we define the complex $\mathrm{DR}^\dagger_\lambda(]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}/\mathcal{Y}_K,\mathcal{E})$ by

$$\mathrm{DR}^\dagger_\lambda(]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}/\mathcal{Y}_K,\mathcal{E}) := \varinjlim_V j_{V,\lambda*}(\mathrm{DR}(V/\mathcal{Y}_K,\mathcal{E})|_{V_\lambda}).$$

Note that, when we have the diagram (4.3) (satisfying $(*)$) instead of (4.2), we can define the complex $\mathrm{DR}^\dagger_\lambda(\mathfrak{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K/\mathcal{Y}_K,\mathcal{E})$ in the same way.

Now let us consider the situation where there does not necessarily exist the diagram (4.2). Let us take an embedding system (4.6) and let h be the morphism $]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}\longrightarrow]\overline{Y}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Y}}$. Then we have the complex $\mathrm{DR}^\dagger_\lambda(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K,\mathcal{E})$ on $]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}$. We define $Rf_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\text{log-rig},\lambda*}\mathcal{E}$, $R^qf_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\text{log-rig},\lambda*}\mathcal{E}$ by

$$Rf_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\text{log-rig},\lambda*}\mathcal{E} := Rh_*\mathrm{DR}^\dagger_\lambda(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K,\mathcal{E}),$$

$$R^qf_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\text{log-rig},\lambda*}\mathcal{E} := R^qh_*\mathrm{DR}^\dagger_\lambda(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K,\mathcal{E}),$$

and we call $R^qf_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\text{log-rig},\lambda*}\mathcal{E}$ the λ-restriction of the q-th relative log rigid cohomology. It is a $j^\dagger_Y\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{Y}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Y}}}$-module. Then we have the following:

Proposition 4.14. *The above definition is independent of the choice of the embedding system.*

Before the proof, we prove the following lemma:

Lemma 4.15. *Let* $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}), (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}))$ *be a log triple. Fix* $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ *and for a strict neighborhood* V *of* $]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$ *in* $]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$, *let us put* $V_\lambda := V \cap]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}$ *and let us denote the admissible open immersion* $V_\lambda \hookrightarrow]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$ *by* $j_{V,\lambda}$. *Then there exists an oriented set* $\mathcal{V}$ *consisting of strict neighborhoods of* $]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$ *in* $]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$ *which is cofinal in the set of all the strict neighborhoods such that the functor* $j_{V,\lambda *}$ *is acyclic for coherent* $\mathcal{O}_V$*-modules for any* $V \in \mathcal{V}$.

Proof. Since we may work Zariski locally on $\mathcal{P}$, we may assume it is affine. Let us take a generator $g_1, g_2, \cdots, g_c$ of $\mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}}) \to \Gamma(\overline{X} - X, \mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}-X}))$ and for $\nu \in p^{\mathbb{Q}_{<0}}$, let $U_{\nu,i}\,(1 \leq i \leq c), U_{\nu,0}, U_\nu$ be the admissible open set $\{|g_i| \geq \nu, |g_i| \geq |g_j|\,(\forall j \neq i)\}, \{|g_j| \leq \nu\,(\forall i)\}, \bigcup_{i=1}^{c} U_{\nu,i}$ of $]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$, respectively. Then, any strict neighborhood $\widetilde{V}$ contains a strict neighborhood V satisfying $V_\lambda = U_\nu \cap]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}$ for some ν. (Here the assumption $\lambda < 1$ is crucial.) So, if we define $\mathcal{V}$ to be the category of strict neighborhoods V satisfying this condition, $\mathcal{V}$ is cofinal in the set of all the strict neighborhoods.

Now we prove that, for $V \in \mathcal{V}$, the functor $j_{V,\lambda *}$ is acyclic for any coherent $\mathcal{O}_V$-module E. Take $\nu_0 \in p^{\mathbb{Q}_{<0}}$ satisfying $V_\lambda = U_{\nu_0} \cap]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}$ and take $\nu \in (0, \nu_0)$. Let us take any affinoid admissible open set W of $]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$. If we put $W_i := W \cap U_{\nu,i}\,(0 \leq i \leq c)$, then $W = \bigcup_{i=0}^{c} W_i$ is an admissible covering of W by affinoid admissible open sets. Then we have $j_{V,\lambda}^{-1}(W_i) = W_i \cap U_{\nu_0} \cap]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda} = \emptyset$ for $i = 0$ and $= W \cap U_{\nu_0,i} \cap]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}$ for $i \neq 0$. If we take a good sequence $\mathbf{a}$ in $\mathbf{A}_r$ (where $r := -\log_p \lambda$), the right hand side for $i \neq 0$ is the union of the affinoid admissible open sets $W \cap U_{\nu_0,i} \cap T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P})_K\ ((a,b) \in \mathbf{a})$. So it is quasi-Stein. Hence we have $H^q(j_{V,\lambda}^{-1}(W_i), E) = 0$ for any i and $q > 0$. This implies that the sheaf associated to the presheaf $W \mapsto H^q(j_{V,\lambda}^{-1}(W), E)$ is zero for $q > 0$, that is, $R^q j_{V,\lambda *} E = 0$ for $q > 0$. So we are done. □

Proof of Propsition 4.14. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 4.7. First, we are reduced to proving the following claims:

claim 1. Assume we are given the Cartesian diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}) \arrow[d, "g"'] \\
(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \arrow[r, "\iota"] & (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})
\end{tikzcd} \tag{4.12}$$

and a log pair $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}))$, where $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})$ is an object in $(\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$, ι is a closed immersion and g is a strict etale hypercovering. Let V_0 be a strict neighborhood of $]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$ in $]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$ and let E be a coherent module on V_0. For a strict neighborhood V contained in V_0, put $V_\lambda := V \cap]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$, $E_{V,\lambda} := E|_{V_\lambda}$ and denote the admissible open immersion $V_\lambda \hookrightarrow]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$ by $j_{V,\lambda}$. On the other hand, let $V_0^{(\bullet)} := g^{-1}(V_0)$ and for a strict neighborhood V contained in V_0, put $V_\lambda^{(\bullet)} := g^{-1}(V_\lambda)$, $E_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda} := E|_{V_\lambda^{(\bullet)}}$ and denote the the admissible open immersion $V_\lambda^{(\bullet)} \hookrightarrow]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}$ by $j_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda}$. Then we have the quasi-isomorphism

$$\varinjlim_V j_{V,\lambda *} E_{V,\lambda} \xrightarrow{=} Rg_{K,*}(\varinjlim_V j_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda *} E_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda}).$$

claim 2. Assume we are given a diagram over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \arrow[r, "\iota_1"] \arrow[d, equal] & (\mathcal{Q}, M_{\mathcal{Q}}) \arrow[d, "g"'] \\
(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \arrow[r, "\iota_2"] & (\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})
\end{tikzcd} \tag{4.13}$$

and a log pair $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}))$, where $(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}}), (\mathcal{Q}, M_{\mathcal{Q}})$ are objects in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$, ι_1, ι_2 are closed immersions and g is a formally log smooth morphism. Let $g_K :]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Q}} \longrightarrow]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$ be the morphism induced by g. Then, for an overconvergent isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ on $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}))/(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$, we have a quasi-isomorphism

$$\mathrm{DR}^\dagger_\lambda(]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}/\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \xrightarrow{=} Rg_{K,*}\mathrm{DR}^\dagger_\lambda(]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \mathcal{E}).$$

First we prove claim 1. Because of the quasi-compactness, quasi-separetedness of g_K (this can be checked after reducing to the case where ι is a homeomorphic exact closed immersion and it is clear in this case) and Lemma 4.15, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
Rg_{K,*}(\varinjlim_V j_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda *} E_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda}) &= \varinjlim_V R(g_K \circ j_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda})_* E_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda} \\
&= \varinjlim_V Rj_{V,\lambda *} R(g_K|_{V_\lambda^{(\bullet)}})_* E_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda}.
\end{aligned}$$

So, if we have

$$R(g_K|_{V_\lambda^{(\bullet)}})_* E_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda} = E_{V,\lambda}, \tag{4.14}$$

we have

$$\varinjlim_V Rj_{V,\lambda *} R(g_K|_{V_\lambda^{(\bullet)}})_* E_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda} = \varinjlim_V Rj_{V,\lambda *} E_{V,\lambda} = \varinjlim_V j_{V,\lambda *} E_{V,\lambda}$$

and so we are done. Now note that the morphism $g_K|_{V_\lambda^{(\bullet)}} : V_\lambda^{(\bullet)} \longrightarrow V_\lambda$ is obtained as the pull-back of the morphism $\mathcal{P}_K^{(\bullet)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}_K$ by $V_\lambda \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_K^{\mathrm{ex}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}_K$. So, for any affinoid admissible open set $U := \mathrm{Spm}\,(\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} A) \subseteq V_\lambda$, the morphism $U \times_{V_\lambda} V_\lambda^{(\bullet)} \longrightarrow U$ is equal to the morphism $(\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)} \times_{\mathcal{P}} \mathrm{Spf}\, A)_K \longrightarrow (\mathrm{Spf}\, A)_K$. So the quasi-isomorphism (4.14) follows from [S3, 3.9]. So we have proved claim 1.

Next we prove claim 2. It is similar to the proof of claim 2 in the proof of Proposition 4.7. Let $(\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{ex}}}), (\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}})$ be the exactification of ι_1, ι_2, respectively. Let

E be a coherent sheaf on a strict neighborhood V_0 of $]X[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}$ in $]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}}= \mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K$ and for a strict neighborhood V contained in V_0, put $V_\lambda := V \cap]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P},\lambda}, E_{V,\lambda} := E|_{V_\lambda}$ and denote the admissible open immersion $V_\lambda \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K$ by $j_{V,\lambda}$. On the other hand, for a strict neighborhood V' of $]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ contained in $g_K^{-1}(V_0)$, put $V'_\lambda := V' \cap]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Q},\lambda}, (g_K^* E)_{V',\lambda} := ((g_K|_{g_K^{-1}(V_0)})^* E)|_{V'_\lambda}$ and denote the admissible open immersion $V'_\lambda \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K$ by $j'_{V,\lambda}$. Then, by the same argument as the proof of Proposition 4.7, we may assume that $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}} = \mathrm{Spf}\, A$ is affine, $\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{ex}} = \mathrm{Spf}\, A[[t_1]]$ and it suffices to prove the quasi-isomorphism

$$\varinjlim{}_V j_{V,\lambda *} E \xrightarrow{=} R g_{K,*}(\varinjlim{}_{V'} j_{V',\lambda *}(g_K^* E)_{V',\lambda} \otimes \Omega^\bullet) \tag{4.15}$$

for any E as above, where $\Omega^\bullet$ is the complex $[\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{ex}}} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{ex}}} dt_1]$. Let $\alpha_1, \cdots \alpha_c \in \Gamma(\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}})$ be a lift of generators of $\mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma(\overline{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}}) \to \Gamma(\overline{X} - X, \mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}-X}))$ and for $\nu \in p^{\mathbb{Q}_{<0}}$, let U_ν be the admissible open subset $\bigcup_{i=1}^c \{|\alpha_i| \geq \nu\}$ in $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K$. To prove the quasi-isomorphism (4.15), it suffices to check on an affinoid admissible open subset W of $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}}_K$ such that $W_\nu := W \cap U_\nu$ is also affinoid for any ν sufficiently close to 1, by Lemma 4.8. For $\lambda' = p^{-b/a}, \nu \in p^{\mathbb{Q}_{<0}}$, let $W_{\lambda',\nu}$ be the admissible open set $T_{a,b}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{ex}})_K \cap W_\nu$ of W, let $g_K^{-1}(W)_{\lambda'}$ be the affinoid admissible open set $\{|t_1| \leq \lambda'\} \cap g_K^{-1}(W_{\lambda'})$ of $g_K^{-1}(W)$ and let $g_K^{-1}(W)_{\lambda',\nu}$ be the affinoid admissible open set $\{|t_1| \leq \lambda'\} \cap g_K^{-1}(W_{\lambda',\nu})$ of $g_K^{-1}(W)$. Then, when λ' is fixed, we have $W_{\lambda',\nu} \subseteq V$, $g_K^{-1}(W)_{\lambda',\nu} \subseteq g_K^{-1}(V)$ for ν sufficiently close to 1. In this case, we denote the restriction of $E, g_K^* E$ to $W_{\lambda',\nu}, g_K^{-1}(W)_{\lambda',\nu}$ by $E_{\lambda',\nu}, (g_K^* E)_{\lambda',\nu}$, respectively. With this notation, we have

$$\Gamma(W, \varinjlim{}_V j_{V,\lambda *} E_{V,\lambda}) = \varinjlim{}_V \Gamma(W \cap V_\lambda, E_{V,\lambda}) = \varinjlim{}_{\nu \to 1-} \varprojlim{}_{\lambda' \to \lambda-} \Gamma(W_{\lambda',\nu}, E_{\lambda',\nu}),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& R\Gamma(g_K^{-1}(W), \varinjlim{}_{V'} j_{V',\lambda *}(g_K^* E)_{V',\lambda} \otimes \Omega^\bullet) \\
&= R\varprojlim{}_{\mu \to 1-} R\Gamma(g_K^{-1}(W)_\mu, \varinjlim{}_{V'} Rj'_{V',\lambda *}(g_K^* E)_{V',\lambda} \otimes \Omega^\bullet) \\
&= R\varprojlim{}_{\mu \to 1-} \varinjlim{}_{V'} R\Gamma(g_K^{-1}(W)_\mu \cap V'_\lambda, (g_K^* E)_{V',\lambda} \otimes \Omega^\bullet) \\
&= \varinjlim{}_{V'} R\Gamma(g_K^{-1}(W)_\lambda \cap V'_\lambda, (g_K^* E)_{V',\lambda} \otimes \Omega^\bullet) \\
&= \varinjlim{}_{\nu \to 1-} R\Gamma(g_K^{-1}(W)_{\lambda,\nu} \cap]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Q},\lambda}, (g_K^* E)_{\lambda,\nu} \otimes \Omega^\bullet) \\
&= \varinjlim{}_{\nu \to 1-} \Gamma(g_K^{-1}(W)_{\lambda,\nu} \cap]\overline{X}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Q},\lambda}, (g_K^* E)_{\lambda,\nu} \otimes \Omega^\bullet) \\
&= \varinjlim{}_{\nu \to 1-} \varprojlim{}_{\lambda' \to \lambda-} \Gamma(g_K^{-1}(W)_{\lambda',\nu}, (g_K^* E)_{\lambda',\nu} \otimes \Omega^\bullet).
\end{aligned}$$

So, to prove the quasi-isomorphism (4.15), it suffices to prove that the complex

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \to \varprojlim{}_{\lambda' \to \lambda-} \Gamma(W_{\lambda',\nu}, E_{\lambda',\nu}) &\to \varprojlim{}_{\lambda' \to \lambda-} \Gamma(g_K^{-1}(W)_{\lambda',\nu}, (g_K^* E)_{\lambda',\nu}) \\
&\to \varprojlim{}_{\lambda' \to \lambda-} \Gamma(g_K^{-1}(W)_{\lambda',\nu}, (g_K^* E)_{\lambda',\nu} \otimes \Omega^1) \to 0
\end{aligned}$$

is exact. We can prove this assertion in the same way as the proof of claim 3 in the proof of Proposition 4.7. So the proof of the proposition is finished. □

Let us go back to the situation where we are given the diagram (4.1) and log pairs $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}})), ((Y, M_Y), (\overline{Y}, M_{\overline{Y}}))$ satisfying $f(X) \subseteq Y$. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be an overconvergent isocrystal on $((X, M_X), (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}))/\mathcal{Y}_K$, take the embedding system

(4.6) and put $(X^{(\bullet)}, M_{X^{(\bullet)}}) := (X, M_X) \times_{(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}})} (\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}})$. Then, for $\lambda \in (0,1)$, we have the canonical map of complexes

$$\mathrm{DR}^{\dagger}(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{DR}^{\dagger}_{\lambda}(]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E}). \tag{4.16}$$

So we obtain the map

$$Rf_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E} \longrightarrow Rf_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\text{log-rig},\lambda*}\mathcal{E} \tag{4.17}$$

from relative log rigid cohomology to its λ-restriction. Then we have the following theorem:

Theorem 4.16. *Let the notation be as above and put* $r := -\log_p \lambda$. *Then, if the morphism* $f : (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \longrightarrow (\overline{Y}, M_{\overline{Y}})$ *is log smooth,* ι *is a homeomorphic exact closed immersion satisfying* $r(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}, \mathrm{Ker}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}} \to \mathcal{O}_{\overline{Y}})) > r$, *the map* (4.17) *is a quasi-isomorphism.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that the map (4.16) is a quasi-isomorphism, and to prove it, we may replace $\bullet$ by $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In this case, we may assume that $\overline{X}^{(n)}$ is affine. Moreover, the both hand sides are unchanged if we change the closed immersion $(\overline{X}^{(n)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(n)}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}^{(n)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}})$ by another closed immersion $(\overline{X}^{(n)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(n)}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}'^{(n)}, M_{\mathcal{P}'^{(n)}})$ such that $(\mathcal{P}'^{(n)}, M_{\mathcal{P}'^{(n)}})$ is formally log smooth over $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$. So we may assume that the closed immersion $(\overline{X}^{(n)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(n)}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}^{(n)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}})$ is exact and satisfies the isomorphism $(\mathcal{P}^{(n)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}}) \times_{(\mathcal{P}, M_{\mathcal{P}})} (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) = (\overline{X}^{(n)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(n)}})$. In this case, we have $r(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}}, \mathrm{Ker}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}} \to \mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}^{(n)}})) \geq r(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}, \mathrm{Ker}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}} \to \mathcal{O}_{\overline{Y}})) > r$. So we have $]\overline{X}^{(n)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)},\lambda} =]\overline{X}^{(n)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}}$. Then it is easy to see that the both hand sides of (4.16) ($\bullet$ replaced by n) coincide. So the theorem is proved. $\square$

Remark 4.17. In the case where all the log structures are trivial and $Y = \overline{Y} = \mathrm{Spec}\, k, \overline{Y} = \mathrm{Spf}\, V$ (where V is a complete discrete valuation ring of mixed characteristic with residue field k), Crew defined in [Cr] the notion of rigid cohomology of radius λ. There is a slight difference between his definition and our definition of λ-restriction of rigid cohomology which is given here. (This is why we did not call our cohomology 'the relative log rigid cohomology of radius λ'.) However, these cohomologies are related: By Theorem 4.16 and the analogue of it for Crew's cohomology, we can deduce that the both cohomology coincide for λ sufficiently close to 1 (under the assumption $Y = \overline{Y} = \mathrm{Spec}\, k, \overline{Y} = \mathrm{Spf}\, V$) if $f : \overline{X} \longrightarrow \overline{Y} = \mathrm{Spec}\, k$ is smooth.

5. Relative rigid cohomology (I): log smooth case

In this section, we give an affirmative answer to Conjecture 0.2 in the case where the given situation admits a 'nice' log structure, by using the results in previous sections. In [S3], the coeffcient of the relative rigid cohomology (which is an overconvergent isocrystal) is assumed to extend to the boundary logarithmically, but here we do not impose such condition on the coefficient. So we prove the conjecture under less assumption.

The first main theorem in this section is the following:

Theorem 5.1. *Assume we are given a diagram*

$$(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \xrightarrow{f} (\overline{Y}, M_{\overline{Y}}) \overset{\iota}{\hookrightarrow} (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}), \tag{5.1}$$

where f is a proper log smooth integral morphism in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$ having log smooth parameter and ι is a closed immersion. Assume moreover that we are given open immersions $j_X : X \hookrightarrow \overline{X}, j_Y : Y \hookrightarrow \overline{Y}$ satisfying $X \subseteq (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}})_{\mathrm{triv}}, Y \subseteq (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})_{\mathrm{triv}}$ and $f^{-1}(Y) = X$. Then, for a locally free overconvergent isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ on $(X, \overline{X})/\mathcal{Y}_K$, the relative rigid cohomology $R^q f_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}$ is a coherent $j_Y^\dagger \mathcal{O}_{]\overline{Y}[_{\mathcal{Y}}}$-module for any $q \geq 0$.

Proof. By Theorem 4.13, it suffices to prove that the relative log rigid cohomology $R^q f_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E}$ is a coherent $j_Y^\dagger \mathcal{O}_{]\overline{Y}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Y}}}$-module for any $q \geq 0$. Let $(\overline{Y}, M_{\overline{Y}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{ex}}})$ be the exactification of ι. We may assume that $\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{ex}}$ is affine. Put $\mathcal{I} := \mathrm{Ker}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{ex}}} \to \mathcal{O}_{\overline{Y}})$, $\mathcal{J} := \mathrm{Ker}(\mathcal{O}_{\overline{Y}} \to \mathcal{O}_{\overline{Y}-Y})$ and let us take a lift $g_1, \cdots, g_c \in \Gamma(\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{ex}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{ex}}})$ of generators of $\Gamma(\overline{Y}, \mathcal{J})$.

Let us take an open covering $\overline{X} = \bigcup_{j \in J} \overline{X}_j$ by finite number of affine subschemes and exact closed immersions $i_j : (\overline{X}_j, M_{\overline{X}_j}) := (\overline{X}_j, M_{\overline{X}}|_{X_j}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}_j, M_{\mathcal{P}_j})\,(j \in J)$ into a fine log formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme $(\mathcal{P}_j, M_{\mathcal{P}_j})$ over $(\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{ex}}})$ satisfying $(\mathcal{P}_j, M_{\mathcal{P}_j}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{ex}}})} (\overline{Y}, M_{\overline{Y}}) = (\overline{X}_j, M_{\overline{X}_j})$ such that each $(\mathcal{P}_j, M_{\mathcal{P}_j})$ is formally log smooth over $(\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{ex}}})$ in the sense that $(\mathcal{P}_j, M_{\mathcal{P}_j})$ is $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_j}$-adically complete and that the morphism

$$(\mathcal{P}_j, M_{\mathcal{P}_j}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{ex}}}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{ex}}}/\mathcal{I}^n \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{ex}}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{ex}}}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{ex}}}/\mathcal{I}^n$$

is log smooth for any n. For any non-empty subset $L \subseteq J$, let $(\overline{X}_L, M_{\overline{X}_L})$ (resp. $(\mathcal{P}_L, M_{\mathcal{P}_L})$) be the fiber product of $(\overline{X}_j, M_{\overline{X}_j})$'s (resp. $(\mathcal{P}_j, M_{\mathcal{P}_j})$'s) for $j \in L$ over $(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}})$ (resp. $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$) and for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(\overline{X}^{(m)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(m)}})$ (resp. $(\mathcal{P}^{(m)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(m)}})$) be the disjoint union of $(\overline{X}_L, M_{\overline{X}_L})$'s (resp. $(\mathcal{P}_L, M_{\mathcal{P}_L})$'s) for $L \subseteq J$ with $|L| = m+1$. Then $(\overline{X}^{(m)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(m)}})$'s and $(\mathcal{P}^{(m)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(m)}})$'s $(m \leq N := |J|-1)$ naturally form diagrams $(\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}}), (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}})$ indexed by the category Δ_N^+ in the paragraph before Proposition 4.10 and we have a canonical diagram

$$(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \xleftarrow{g^{(\bullet)}} (\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}) \tag{5.2}$$

over $(\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{ex}}, M_{\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{ex}}})$.

Let $\{(T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Y}), M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Y})})\}_{(a,b)\in\mathbf{A}}$ be the system of universal enlargements of $((\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}}), (\overline{Y}, M_{\overline{Y}}))$. Let us take $\mu = p^{-b/a} \in p^{\mathbb{Q}_{<0}}$ and put $(\mathcal{Y}_\mu, M_{\mathcal{Y}_\mu}) := (T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Y}), M_{T_{a,b}(\mathcal{Y})})$. Let us denote the canonical morphism $(\mathcal{Y}_\mu, M_{\mathcal{Y}_\mu}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ by φ_μ. Let us denote the base change of the diagram 5.1 by φ_μ by

$$(\overline{X}_\mu, M_{\overline{X}_\mu}) \longrightarrow (\overline{Y}_\mu, M_{\overline{Y}_\mu}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}_\mu, M_{\mathcal{Y}_\mu}) \tag{5.3}$$

and let us denote the base change of the diagram (5.2) by φ_μ by

$$(\overline{X}_\mu, M_{\overline{X}_\mu}) \longleftarrow (\overline{X}_\mu^{(\bullet)}, M_{\overline{X}_\mu^{(\bullet)}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}_\mu^{(\bullet)}, M_{\mathcal{P}_\mu^{(\bullet)}}). \tag{5.4}$$

Put $X_\mu := X \times_{\overline{X}} \overline{X}_\mu, Y_\mu := Y \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Y}_\mu$ and $X_\mu^{(\bullet)} := X \times_{\overline{X}} \overline{X}_\mu^{(\bullet)}$. Then $]\overline{Y}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{Y}} = \bigcup_\mu]\overline{Y}[_{\mathcal{Y}_\mu} = \bigcup_\mu \mathcal{Y}_{\mu,K}$ is an admissible covering and we have $R^q f_{(X_\mu,\overline{X}_\mu)/\mathcal{Y}_\mu,\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E} = (R^q f_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E})|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,K}}$. So it suffices to prove that $R^q f_{(X_\mu,\overline{X}_\mu)/\mathcal{Y}_\mu,\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E}$ is a coherent $j_Y^\dagger \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,K}}$-module.

Let h be the morphism $]\overline{X}_\mu^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_\mu^{(\bullet)}} \longrightarrow]\overline{Y}_\mu[_{\mathcal{Y}_\mu} = \mathcal{Y}_{\mu,K}$ and put $\mathrm{DR}^{\dagger,(\bullet)} := \mathrm{DR}^\dagger(]\overline{X}_\mu^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_\mu^{(\bullet)}} /\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,K}, \mathcal{E})$. For any sufficiently small strict neighborhood $V^{(\bullet)}$ of $]X_\mu^{(\bullet)}[_{\mathcal{P}_\mu^{(\bullet)}}$ in $]\overline{X}_\mu^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_\mu^{(\bullet)}}$ indexed by Δ_N^+, we have the log de Rham complex $\mathrm{DR}_{V^{(\bullet)}} := \mathrm{DR}(V^{(\bullet)}/\mathcal{Y}_K, \mathcal{E})$ compatible with respect to $V^{(\bullet)}$ satisfying $\mathrm{DR}^{\dagger,(\bullet)} = \varinjlim_{V^{(\bullet)}} j_{V^{(\bullet)},*}\mathrm{DR}_{V^{(\bullet)}}$. (Here $j_{V^{(\bullet)}}$ denotes the admissible open immersion $V^{(\bullet)} \hookrightarrow]\overline{X}_\mu^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_\mu^{(\bullet)}}$.) For $V^{(\bullet)}$ as above and for $\lambda \in (0,1)$, we put $V_\lambda^{(\bullet)} := V^{(\bullet)} \cap]\overline{X}_\mu^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_\mu^{(\bullet)},\lambda}$ and put $\mathrm{DR}_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda} := \mathrm{DR}_{V^{(\bullet)}}|_{V_\lambda^{(\bullet)}}$. Denote the admissible open immersions $V_\lambda^{(\bullet)} \hookrightarrow V^{(\bullet)}$ by $i_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda}$ and denote the composite $V_\lambda^{(\bullet)} \overset{i_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda}}{\hookrightarrow} V^{(\bullet)} \overset{j_{V^{(\bullet)}}}{\hookrightarrow}]\overline{X}_\mu^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}_\mu^{(\bullet)}}$ by $j_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda}$. Then, as complexes of sheaves, we have $\mathrm{DR}_{V^{(\bullet)}} = \varprojlim_\lambda i_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda*}\mathrm{DR}_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda}$.

For $\nu = p^{-1/e} \in (0,1)$, let U_ν be the admissible open subset $\bigcup_{i=1}^c \{|g_i| \geq \nu\}$ of $\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,K}$ and denote the open immersion $U_\nu \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\mu,K}$ by $j_{Y,\nu}$. Let us denote the inverse image of U_ν in $]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}}$ by $U_\nu^{(\bullet)}$ and let us put $U_{\lambda,\nu}^{(\bullet)} := U_\nu^{(\bullet)} \cap]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)},\lambda}$. Then, for any fixed $\lambda \in (0,1)$, the category of strict neighborhoods $V^{(\bullet)}$ satisfying the condition $V_\lambda^{(\bullet)} = U_{\lambda,\nu}^{(\bullet)}$ is cofinal with the category of all the strict neighborhoods. When this condition is satisfied, we denote the de Rham complex $\mathrm{DR}_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda}$ by $\mathrm{DR}_{\lambda,\nu}^{(\bullet)}$ and denote the morphism $V_\lambda^{(\bullet)} = U_{\lambda,\nu}^{(\bullet)} \longrightarrow U_\nu$ by $h_{\lambda,\nu}$.

With the above notation, we have the following diagram:

$$
\begin{aligned}
Rf_{(X_\mu,\overline{X}_\mu)/\mathcal{Y}_\mu,\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E} &= Rh_*\mathrm{DR}^{\dagger,(\bullet)} = Rh_* \varinjlim_{V^{(\bullet)}} j_{V^{(\bullet)},*}\mathrm{DR}_{V^{(\bullet)}} \\
&= Rh_* \varinjlim_{V^{(\bullet)}} j_{V^{(\bullet)},*} \varprojlim_\lambda i_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda*}\mathrm{DR}_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda} \\
&= Rh_* \varinjlim_{V^{(\bullet)}} \varprojlim_\lambda j_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda*}\mathrm{DR}_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda} \\
&\xrightarrow{\varphi_1} Rh_* R\varprojlim_\lambda \varinjlim_{V^{(\bullet)}} j_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda*}\mathrm{DR}_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda} \\
&= R\varprojlim_\lambda Rh_* \varinjlim_{V^{(\bullet)}} j_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda*}\mathrm{DR}_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda} \\
&= R\varprojlim_\lambda Rh_* \varinjlim_{V^{(\bullet)}} Rj_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda*}\mathrm{DR}_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda} \qquad \text{(Lemma 4.15)} \\
&\xleftarrow{\varphi_2} R\varprojlim_\lambda \varinjlim_{V^{(\bullet)}} R(h \circ j_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda})_*\mathrm{DR}_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda} \\
&= R\varprojlim_\lambda (\varinjlim_\nu Rj_{Y,\nu,*}Rh_{\lambda,\nu*}\mathrm{DR}_{\lambda,\nu}^{(\bullet)}).
\end{aligned}
$$

By the above diagram, we see that, to prove the theorem, it suffices to prove the following claim:

claim. With the notation above,

(1) The map φ_1 is a quasi-isomorphism.

(2) The map φ_2 is a quasi-isomorphism.
(3) If we fix $\lambda \in (p^{-r(X,Y;\sqrt{\mu})}, 1)$, $Rh_{\lambda,\nu *}\mathrm{DR}^{(\bullet)}_{\lambda,\nu}$ has bounded and coherent cohomologies for ν sufficiently close to 1, which are compatible with respect to ν.
(4) $\varinjlim_\nu Rj_{Y,\nu,*}Rh_{\lambda,\nu *}\mathrm{DR}^{(\bullet)}_{\lambda,\nu}$ is independent of λ for $\lambda \in (p^{-r(X,Y;\sqrt{\mu})}, 1)$.

Indeed, let us assume the claim is proved. Then we have $R^q f_{(X_\mu,\overline{X}_\mu)/\mathcal{Y}_\mu,\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E} = \varinjlim_\nu j_{Y,\nu,*}R^q h_{\lambda,\nu *}\mathrm{DR}^{(\bullet)}_{\lambda,\nu}$ (because $j_{Y,\nu}$ is acyclic for coherent modules by the proof of Lemma 4.15) and so $R^q f_{(X_\mu,\overline{X}_\mu)/\mathcal{Y}_\mu,\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E}$ is a coherent $j_Y^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,K}}$-module. So, in the following, we will prove the above claim.

First we prove the claim (1). Note that $R\varprojlim_\lambda Rh_* \varinjlim_{V^{(\bullet)}} j_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda *}\mathrm{DR}_{V^{(\bullet)},\lambda}$, which is quasi-isomorphic to the target of the map φ_1, is nothing but $R\varprojlim_\lambda Rf_{(X_\mu,\overline{X}_\mu)/\mathcal{Y}_\mu,\text{log-rig},\lambda *}$ $\mathcal{E}$. Since we have the canonical quasi-isomorphism

$$Rf_{(X_\mu,\overline{X}_\mu)/\mathcal{Y}_\mu,\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{=} Rf_{(X_\mu,\overline{X}_\mu)/\mathcal{Y}_\mu,\text{log-rig},\lambda *}\mathcal{E}$$

for $\lambda > \mu$ by Theorem 4.16, we have $R\varprojlim_\lambda Rf_{(X_\mu,\overline{X}_\mu)/\mathcal{Y}_\mu,\text{log-rig},\lambda *}\mathcal{E} = Rf_{(X_\mu,\overline{X}_\mu)/\mathcal{Y}_\mu,\text{log-rig},\lambda_0 *}\mathcal{E}$ for any fixed $\lambda_0 \in (\mu, 1)$ and it is quasi-isomorphic to $Rf_{(X_\mu,\overline{X}_\mu)/\mathcal{Y}_\mu,\text{log-rig}*}\mathcal{E}$ via φ_1. So claim (1) is proved.

Next we prove (3). For $0 \le n \le N$ and $i = 0, 1, 2$, let $(\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_\mu(i), M_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_\mu(i)})$ be the $(i+1)$-fold fiber product of $(\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_\mu, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_\mu})$ over $(\mathcal{Y}_\mu, M_{\mathcal{Y}_\mu})$. Then the restriction of $\mathcal{E}$ to $I^\dagger((X_\mu,\overline{X}_\mu)/\mathcal{Y}_\mu) = I^\dagger(((X_\mu,\overline{X}_\mu)/\mathcal{Y}_\mu)^{\log})$ induces a compatible family (with respect to $n = 0, 1, 2$) of modules with stratifications on some strict neighborhood of $]X^{(n)}_\mu[_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_\mu}$ in $]\overline{X}^{(n)}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}}$: Precisely speaking, there exist strict neighborhoods $V^n(i)\,(0 \le n \le N, i = 0, 1, 2)$ of $]X^{(n)}_\mu[_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_\mu(i)}$ in $]\overline{X}^{(n)}_\mu[_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_\mu(i)}$ with $p_k(V^{(n)}(1)) \subseteq V^{(n)}(0), p_{kl}(V^{(n)}(2)) \subseteq V^{(n)}(1), \Delta(V^{(n)}(0)) \subseteq V^{(n)}(1)$ (where p_k, p_{kl} are projections

$$p_k :]\overline{X}^{(n)}_\mu[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_\mu(1)} \longrightarrow]\overline{X}^{(n)}_\mu[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_\mu}\ (k = 1, 2),$$
$$p_{kl} :]\overline{X}^{(n)}_\mu[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_\mu(2)} \longrightarrow]\overline{X}^{(n)}_\mu[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_\mu(1)}\ (1 \le k < l < 3)$$

and Δ is the diagonal $]\overline{X}^{(n)}_\mu[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_\mu} \longrightarrow]\overline{X}^{(n)}_\mu[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_\mu(1)}$) which is compatible with respsect to n such that the restriction of $\mathcal{E}$ to $I^\dagger((X_\mu,\overline{X}_\mu)/\mathcal{Y}_\mu)$ is induced from the compatible family $(E^{(n)}, \epsilon^{(n)})_{0 \le n \le N}$, where $E^{(n)}$ is a locally free $\mathcal{O}_{V^{(n)}(0)}$-module and $\epsilon^{(n)}$ is the isomorphism $p_2^* E^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\cong} p_1^* E^{(n)}$ on $V^{(n)}(1)$ satisfying $\Delta^*(\epsilon^{(n)}) = \mathrm{id}, p_{12}^*(\epsilon^{(n)}) \circ p_{23}^*(\epsilon^{(n)})$ $= p_{13}^*(\epsilon^{(n)})$.

Now let us take $\lambda \in (p^{-r(X,Y,\sqrt{\mu})}, 1)$ and fix it. For $\nu = p^{-1/e} \in (0, 1)\,(e \in \mathbb{N})$, let us denote the inverse image of U_ν in $]\overline{X}^{(n)}_\mu[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_\mu(i)}$ by $U^{(n)}_\nu(i)$. Then, by taking ν suffiently close to 1, we may assume that the inclusion $U^{(n)}_{\lambda,\nu}(i) := U^{(n)}_\nu(i) \cap]\overline{X}^{(n)}_\mu[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_\mu(i),\lambda} \subseteq V^{(n)}(i)$ for all $0 \le n \le N, i = 0, 1, 2$. Note that the restriction of $(E^{(n)}, \epsilon^{(n)})_{0 \le n \le N}$ to $U^{(n)}_{\lambda,\nu}(i)$ induces the log de Rham complex $\mathrm{DR}^{(n)}_{\lambda,\nu}$ above.

Now, for $1 \leq j \leq c$ and $\nu = p^{-1/e}$ as above, we put $\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j} := \underline{\mathrm{Spf}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}_\mu}}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}_\mu}[t]/(g_j^e t - p))^\wedge, M_{\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j}} := M_{\mathcal{Y}_\mu}|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j}}$. Then we have $U_\nu = \bigcup_{j=1}^c \mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j,K}$. Let us denote the canonical morphism $(\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j}, M_{\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}_\mu, M_{\mathcal{Y}_\mu})$ by $\psi_{\nu,j}$, let us denote the base change of the diagrams (5.3), (5.4) by $\psi_{\nu,j}$ by

$$(\overline{X}_{\mu,\nu,j}, M_{\overline{X}_{\mu,\nu,j}}) \longrightarrow (\overline{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j}, M_{\overline{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j}, M_{\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j}}), \tag{5.5}$$

$$(\overline{X}_{\mu,\nu,j}, M_{\overline{X}_{\mu,\nu,j}}) \longleftarrow (\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}_{\mu,\nu,j}, M_{\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}_{\mu,\nu,j}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}_{\mu,\nu,j}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}_{\mu,\nu,j}}), \tag{5.6}$$

respectively and let us define $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_{\mu,\nu,j}(i)$ in the same way as $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_{\mu}(i)$. Then, for $0 \leq n \leq N$ and $i = 0,1,2$, $]\overline{X}^{(n)}_{\mu,\nu,j}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_{\mu,\nu,j}(i)}$ is an admissible open subset of $]\overline{X}^{(n)}_{\mu}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_{\mu}(i)}$ and we have $U^{(n)}_{\lambda,\nu}(i) \cap]\overline{X}^{(n)}_{\mu,\nu,j}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_{\mu,\nu,j}(i)} =]\overline{X}^{(n)}_{\mu,\nu,j}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_{\mu,\nu,j}(i),\lambda}$. So $(E^{(n)}, \epsilon^{(n)})$ $(0 \leq n \leq N)$ defines naturally an object in $\mathrm{Str}''_\lambda((\overline{X}^{(n)}_{\mu,\nu,j} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}^{(n)}_{\mu,\nu,j}/\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j})^{\log})$ which is compatible with respect to n, that is, an object (which we denote by $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda,\nu,j}$) in $I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((\overline{X}_{\mu,\nu,j}/\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j})^{\log})$ such that the log de Rham complex associated to it is nothing but the complex $\mathrm{DR}^{(\bullet)}_{\lambda,\nu}|_{]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}_{\mu,\nu,j}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}_{\mu,\nu,j},\lambda}}$. If we denote the morphism $]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}_{\mu,\nu,j}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}_{\mu,\nu,j},\lambda} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j,K}$ by $h_{\lambda,\nu,j}$, we have the isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned}(R^q h_{\lambda,\nu*}\mathrm{DR}^{(\bullet)}_{\lambda,\nu})|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j}} &= R^q h_{\lambda,\nu,j*}(\mathrm{DR}^{(\bullet)}_{\lambda,\nu}|_{]\overline{X}^{(\bullet)}_{\mu,\nu,j}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(\bullet)}_{\mu,\nu,j},\lambda}}) \\ &= R^q f_{\overline{X}_{\mu,\nu,j}/\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j},\lambda\text{-an}*}\mathcal{E}_{\lambda,\nu,j}.\end{aligned}$$

Since the morphisms φ_μ and $\psi_{\nu,j}$ are affine, we have $a(\overline{X}_{\mu,\nu,j}) \leq a(\overline{X})$. So we have $r(\overline{X}_{\mu,\nu,j}, \mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j}; \sqrt{\mu}) \geq r(\overline{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \sqrt{\mu})$. Hence, by Theorem 3.7, $R^q f_{\overline{X}_{\mu,\nu,j}/\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j}\lambda\text{-an}*}\mathcal{E}_{\mu,\nu,j}$ is a coherent module on $]\overline{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j}[_{\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j},\sqrt{\mu}} = \mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j,K}$. So we have proved the former part of claim (3). Moreover, the analytically flat base change implies that the above cohomology is compatible with respect to ν. So the proof of claim (3) is finished.

Next we prove claim (4). Take $\lambda' > \lambda > r(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}; \sqrt{\mu})$. Then, if ν is sufficiently close to 1, the isocrystal $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda',\nu,j} \in I_{\lambda'\text{-conv}}((\overline{X}_{\mu,\nu,j}/\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j})^{\log})$ analogous to $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda,\nu,j}$ above is defined and $R^q f_{\overline{X}_{\mu,\nu,j}/\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j},\lambda'\text{-an}*}\mathcal{E}_{\lambda',\nu,j}$ is coherent. In this case, $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda,\nu,j}$ is the restriction of $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda',\nu,j}$ to $I_{\lambda\text{-conv}}((\overline{X}_{\mu,\nu,j}/\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j})^{\log})$ and so we have the canonical isomorphism $R^q f_{\overline{X}_{\mu,\nu,j}/\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j},\lambda'\text{-an}*}\mathcal{E}_{\lambda',\nu,j} \cong R^q f_{\overline{X}_{\mu,\nu,j}/\mathcal{Y}_{\mu,\nu,j},\lambda\text{-an}*}\mathcal{E}_{\lambda,\nu,j}$ by Proposition 3.6. So we have

$$\begin{aligned}\varinjlim_\nu Rj_{Y,\nu,*}Rh_{\lambda',\nu*}\mathrm{DR}^{(\bullet)}_{\lambda',\nu} &= \varinjlim_\nu j_{Y,\nu,*}Rh_{\lambda',\nu*}\mathrm{DR}^{(\bullet)}_{\lambda',\nu} \\ &= \varinjlim_\nu j_{Y,\nu,*}Rh_{\lambda,\nu*}\mathrm{DR}^{(\bullet)}_{\lambda,\nu} = \varinjlim_\nu Rj_{Y,\nu,*}Rh_{\lambda,\nu*}\mathrm{DR}^{(\bullet)}_{\lambda,\nu}.\end{aligned}$$

So claim (4) is proved.

Finally we prove claim (2). To prove claim (2), we may compare both hand sides before taking $R\varprojlim_\lambda$ and we may replace $\bullet$ in the source and the target by $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, we see that the source and the target are unchanged even if we replace the closed immersion $(\overline{X}^{(n)}_\mu, M_{\overline{X}^{(n)}_\mu}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_\mu, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_\mu})$ by another closed immersion

$(\overline{X}^{(n)}_{\mu}, M_{\overline{X}^{(n)}_{\mu}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}'^{(n)}_{\mu}, M_{\mathcal{P}'^{(n)}_{\mu}})$ such that $(\mathcal{P}'^{(n)}_{\mu}, M_{\mathcal{P}'^{(n)}_{\mu}})$ is formally log smooth over $(\mathcal{Y}_{\mu}, M_{\mathcal{Y}_{\mu}})$: As for the source, it is true because the source is obtained as $\varinjlim_{\nu} Rj_{Y,\nu,*}$ of the relative log analytic cohomology of radius λ (as we saw above) and as for the target, it is true because the target is obtained as the λ-restriction of the relative log rigid cohomology. So we may replace $(\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_{\mu}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_{\mu}})$ so that $(\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_{\mu}, M_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_{\mu}}) \times_{(\mathcal{Y}_{\mu}, M_{\mathcal{Y}_{\mu}})} (\overline{Y}_{\mu}, M_{\overline{Y}_{\mu}}) = (\overline{X}^{(n)}_{\mu}, M_{\overline{X}^{(n)}_{\mu}})$ holds. In this case, Rh_* commutes with direct limit because $h :]\overline{X}^{(n)}_{\mu}[^{\log}_{\mathcal{P}^{(n)}_{\mu}} = \mathcal{P}^{(n)}_{\mu,K} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\mu,K}$ is quasi-compact and quasi-separated. So the map φ_2 is a quasi-isomorphism. So claim (2) is proved.

Since the claim is proved, the proof of the theorem is finished. □

Let us take a triple of the form $(S, S, \mathcal{S})$ and assume we are given a diagram

$$(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \xrightarrow{f} (\overline{Y}, M_{\overline{Y}}) \xrightarrow{g} S$$

and open immersions $j_X : X \hookrightarrow \overline{X}, j_Y : Y \hookrightarrow \overline{Y}$ with $X \subseteq (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}})_{\mathrm{triv}}, Y \subseteq (\overline{Y}, M_{\overline{Y}})_{\mathrm{triv}}$ and $f^{-1}(Y) = X$, where f is a proper log smooth integral morphism in (LS/B) having log smooth parameter and g is a morphism in (LS/B). Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a locally free overconvergent isocrystal on $(X, \overline{X})/\mathcal{S}_K$. Then we have the following theorem, which is the main result in this section:

Theorem 5.2. *Let the notations be as above. Then there exists a diagram*

$$\overline{Y} \xleftarrow{g^{(0)}} \overline{Y}^{(0)} \overset{i^{(0)}}{\hookrightarrow} \mathcal{Y}^{(0)},$$

where $g^{(0)}$ *is an etale surjective morphism,* $i^{(0)}$ *is a closed immersion and* $\mathcal{Y}^{(0)}$ *is formally smooth over* $\mathcal{S}$*, which satisfies the following: For* $q \geq 0$*, there exists uniquely an overconvergent isocrystal* $\mathcal{F}$ *on* $(Y, \overline{Y})/\mathcal{S}_K$ *such that, for any triple* $(Z, \overline{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ *over* $(Y^{(0)}, \overline{Y}^{(0)}, \mathcal{Y}^{(0)})$ *(where* $Y^{(0)} := Y \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Y}^{(0)}$*) satisfying* $Z = Y^{(0)} \times_{\overline{Y}^{(0)}} \overline{Z}$ *with* $\mathcal{Z}$ *formally smooth over* $\mathcal{Y}$*, the restriction of* $\mathcal{F}$ *to* $I^{\dagger}((Z, \overline{Z})/\mathcal{S}_K, \mathcal{Z})$ *is given functorially by* $(R^q f_{(X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*} \mathcal{E}, \epsilon)$*, where* ϵ *is given by*

$$p_2^* R^q f_{(X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*} \mathcal{E} \overset{\simeq}{\rightarrow} R^q f_{(X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z} \times_S \mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*} \mathcal{E} \overset{\simeq}{\leftarrow} p_1^* R^q f_{(X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*} \mathcal{E}.$$

(Here p_i *is the morphism* $]\overline{Z}[_{\mathcal{Z} \times_S \mathcal{Z}} \longrightarrow]\overline{Z}[_{\mathcal{Z}}$ *induced by the* i*-th projection.)*

Proof. Let us take a diagram

$$(\overline{Y}, M_{\overline{Y}}) \xleftarrow{g^{(0)}} (\overline{Y}^{(0)}, M_{\overline{Y}^{(0)}}) \overset{i^{(0)}}{\hookrightarrow} (\mathcal{Y}^{(0)}, M_{\mathcal{Y}^{(0)}})$$

such that $g^{(0)}$ is strict etale surjective, $i^{(0)}$ is a closed immersion in $(p\mathrm{LFS}/\mathcal{B})$, $(\mathcal{Y}^{(0)}, M_{\mathcal{Y}^{(0)}})$ is formally log smooth over $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{Y}^{(0)}$ is formally smooth over $\mathcal{S}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(\overline{Y}^{(n)}, M_{\overline{Y}^{(n)}})$ (resp. $(\mathcal{Y}^{(n)}, M_{\mathcal{Y}^{(n)}})$) be the $(n+1)$-fold fiber product of $(\overline{Y}^{(0)}, M_{\overline{Y}^{(0)}})$ (resp. $(\mathcal{Y}^{(0)}, M_{\mathcal{Y}^{(0)}})$) over $(\overline{Y}, M_{\overline{Y}})$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}$) and denote the pull-back of $(\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}), X$ by the morphism $(\overline{Y}^{(n)}, M_{\overline{Y}^{(n)}}) \longrightarrow (\overline{Y}, M_{\overline{Y}})$ by $(\overline{X}^{(n)}, M_{\overline{X}^{(n)}}), X^{(n)}$, respectively. Then, by Theorem 5.1, $R^q f_{(X^{(n)}, \overline{X}^{(n)})/\mathcal{Y}^{(n)}, \mathrm{rig}*} \mathcal{E}$ (resp. $R^q f_{(X^{(n)}, \overline{X}^{(n)})/\mathcal{Y}^{(n)} \times_S \mathcal{Y}^{(n)}},$

${}_{\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E})$ is a coherent $j_Y^\dagger \mathcal{O}_{]\overline{Y}^{(n)}[_{\mathcal{Y}^{(n)}}}$-module (resp. a coherent $j_Y^\dagger \mathcal{O}_{]\overline{Y}^{(n)}[_{\mathcal{Y}^{(n)} \times_{\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{Y}^{(n)}}}$-module). Then, by the base change theorem of Tsuzuki ([T3, 2.3.1]), the arrows in the diagram

$$p_2^* R^q f_{(X^{(n)},\overline{X}^{(n)})/\mathcal{Y}^{(n)},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E} \to R^q f_{(X^{(n)},\overline{X}^{(n)})/\mathcal{Y}^{(n)} \times_{\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{Y}^{(n)},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E} \leftarrow p_1^* R^q f_{(X^{(n)},\overline{X}^{(n)})/\mathcal{Y}^{(n)},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}$$

(where p_i denotes the i-th projection $]\overline{Y}^{(n)}[_{\mathcal{Y}^{(n)} \times_{\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{Y}^{(n)}} \longrightarrow]\overline{Y}^{(n)}[_{\mathcal{Y}^{(n)}}$) are isomorphisms. If we denote the composite of the above arrows by $\epsilon^{(n)}$, one can see (by using [T3, 2.3.1] again) that $\mathcal{F}^{(n)} := (R^q f_{(X^{(n)},\overline{X}^{(n)})/\mathcal{Y}^{(n)},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}, \epsilon^{(n)})$ defines an overconvergent isocrystal on $(Y^{(n)}, \overline{Y}^{(n)})/\mathcal{S}_K$ and that $\mathcal{F}^{(n)}$ is compatible with respect to n. Then, by etale descent of overconvergent isocrystals ([S3, 5.1]), we see that $\{\mathcal{F}^{(n)}\}_{n=0,1,2}$ descents to an overconvergent isocrystal $\mathcal{F}$ on $(Y, \overline{Y})/\mathcal{S}_K$.

Next we prove the uniqueness of $\mathcal{F}$. Since the triple $(Y^{(n)}, \overline{Y}^{(n)}, \mathcal{Y}^{(n)})$ satisfies the condition required for $(Z, \overline{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ in the theorem, we see that the image of $\mathcal{F}$ in $I^\dagger((Y^{(n)}, \overline{Y}^{(n)})/\mathcal{S}_K)$ should be functorially isomorphic to $\mathcal{F}^{(n)}$ in the previous paragraph. Then, by [S3, 5.1], we see that this condition characterizes $\mathcal{F}$ uniquely.

Finally we prove that the overconvergent isocrystal $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies the required condition. For a triple $(Z, \overline{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ as in the statement of the theorem, let us put $M_{\overline{Z}} := M_{\overline{Y}}|_{\overline{Z}}, M_{\mathcal{Z}} := M_{\mathcal{Y}}|_{\mathcal{Z}}$. Then the diagram

$$(\overline{Z}, M_{\overline{Z}}) \times_{(\overline{Y}, M_{\overline{Y}})} (\overline{X}, M_{\overline{X}}) \longrightarrow (\overline{Z}, M_{\overline{Z}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{Z}, M_{\mathcal{Z}})$$

and the open immersions $Z \times_Y X \longrightarrow \overline{Z} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{X}, Z \hookrightarrow \overline{Z}$ are as in the situation in Theorem 5.1. So, by Theorem 5.1, $R^q f_{(Z \times_Y X, \overline{Z} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{X})/\mathcal{Z},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}$ is a coherent $j^\dagger \mathcal{O}_{]\overline{Z}[_{\mathcal{Z}}}$-module. Then, by [T3, 2.3.1] again, we see that the restriction of $\mathcal{F}$ to $I^\dagger((Z, \overline{Z})/\mathcal{S}_K)$ is given by $(R^q f_{(X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}, \epsilon)$ as in the statement of the theorem. Finally, the functoriality of the expression above is proved as the proof of [S3, 4.8]. So we are done. $\square$

6. PRELIMINARIES ON ALTERATION AND HYPERCOVERING

In this section, we recall some preliminary facts on alteration proved by de Jong ([dJ], [dJ2]) and using these, we prove the existence of certain diagram involving hypercovering. This diagram turns out to be useful to prove the overconvergence of relative rigid cohomology in general case, as is shown in the next section.

From now on in this paper, we assume that k is perfect and $\mathcal{B} = \operatorname{Spf} W(k)$ (hence $B = \operatorname{Spec} k$). (So all the schemes are k-schemes separated of finite type and all the pairs are pairs separated of finite type over k.)

First let us recall the notion of pluri nodal fibration, which was introduced in [dJ2]:

Definition 6.1. *Let S be a scheme. A pluri nodal fibration of relative dimension d over S is a system $(X_d \xrightarrow{f_d} X_{d-1} \xrightarrow{f_{d-1}} \cdots X_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} X_0 = S, \{\sigma_{ij}\}_{1 \le i \le d, 1 \le j \le n_i}, Z_0)$ satisfying the following conditions:*

1. *Each $f_i : X_i \longrightarrow X_{i-1}$ is a quasi-split semistable curve over X_{i-1}.*
2. *Z_0 is a proper closed subset of S.*

(3) *For each* i, $\sigma_{ij} : X_{i-1} \longrightarrow X_i \, (1 \leq j \leq n_i)$ *are disjoint sections of* f_i *into smooth locus.*
(4) *If we define* $Z_i \subseteq X_i$ *inductively by* $Z_i := \bigcup_j \sigma_{ij}(X_{i-1}) \cup f_i^{-1}(Z_i)$, $f_{i+1} : X_{i+1} \longrightarrow X_i$ *is smooth over* $X_i - Z_i$.

Then de Jong proved in [dJ2, Thm 5.9] the following theorem:

Theorem 6.2. *Let* $f : X \longrightarrow S$ *be a proper morphism of integral schemes such that the generic fiber is geometrically irreducible of dimension* $d \geq 1$. *Then we have a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd} X \arrow[d, "f"'] & X_d \arrow[l, "\psi"'] \arrow[d, "g"] \\ S & S', \arrow[l] \end{tikzcd}$$

where the horizontal arrows are alterations and g *is* (*a part of a system of*) *a pluri nodal fibration over* S'.

Let

$$X_d \overset{g_d}{\to} X_{d-1} \overset{g_{d-1}}{\to} \cdots X_1 \overset{g_1}{\to} X_0 = S', \qquad Z_i \subseteq X_i \, (0 \leq i \leq d) \tag{6.1}$$

be a part of the data of pluri nodal fibration g appearing in Theorem 6.2. Then, by [dJ, Thm 4.1], there exists an alteration $\varphi : X_0' \longrightarrow X_0$ such that X_0' is regular and that $\varphi^{-1}(Z_0)$ is a simple normal crossing divisor in X_0'. So, by taking the base change by φ, we may assume that, in the diagram (6.1), $X_0 = S'$ is regular and Z_0 is a simple normal crossing divisor in X_0 without changing the conclusion of Theorem 6.2.

Next let us recall the following proposition, which is proved in [dJ, Prop 5.11]:

Proposition 6.3. *Let* S *be a regular scheme, let* $D \subseteq S$ *be a normal crossing divisor and let* $f : X \longrightarrow S$ *be a quasi-split semi-stable curve which is smooth over* $S - D$. *Assume moreover that we are given disjoint sections* $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n$ *of* f *into smooth locus. Then there exists a modification* $X' \longrightarrow X$ *satisfying the following conditions*:

(1) X' *is regular and the center of the modification* $X' \longrightarrow X$ *is contained in non-regular locus of* X.
(2) *There exist lifts of sections* $\widetilde{\sigma}_i : S \longrightarrow X' \, (1 \leq i \leq n)$ *of* σ_i *such that* $D' := \bigcup_i \widetilde{\sigma}_i(S) \cup f'^{-1}(D)$ *is a normal crossing divisor in* X', *where* f' *is the composite* $X' \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow S$.

Moreover, by the proof of [dJ, Prop 5.11], one has the following local expression of the morphism $f' : X' \longrightarrow S$. If we take $x \in X'(\overline{k})$ and put $s := f'(x) \in S(\overline{k})$ (where $\overline{k}$ is the algebraic closure of k), the homomorphism $f'^{*} : \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s} \longrightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}$ induced by f' has one of the following two form:

(1) f'^{*} has the form

$$\overline{k}[[t_1, \cdots, t_n]] \longrightarrow \overline{k}[[t_1, \cdots, t_n, u, v]]/(uv - t_1).$$

In this case, D has the form $\bigcup_{i=1}^r \{t_i = 0\}$ for some $r \geq 1$ and D' has the form $\{u = 0\} \cup \{v = 0\} \cup (\bigcup_{i=2}^r \{t_i = 0\})$.
(2) f'^* has the form

$$\overline{k}[[t_1, \cdots, t_n]] \longrightarrow \overline{k}[[t_1, \cdots, t_n, y]].$$

In this case, D has the form $\bigcup_{i=1}^r \{t_i = 0\}$ for some $r \geq 0$ and D' has either the form $\bigcup_{i=1}^r \{t_i = 0\}$ or the form $\bigcup_{i=1}^r \{t_i = 0\} \cup \{y = 0\}$.

Now, given a pluri nodal fibration (6.1) such that X_0 is regular and Z_0 is a normal crossing divisor, let us apply the following procedure for $i = 1, \cdots, d$ inductively: Apply Proposition 6.3 to the morphism $X_i \longrightarrow X_{i-1}$, the divisor $Z_{i-1} \subseteq X_{i-1}$ and the sections $\{\sigma_{ij}\}_j$ to obtain $Z'_i \subseteq X'_i \longrightarrow X_{i-1}$ and replace $Z_{i'}, X_{i'}, \{\sigma_{i'j}\}$ $(i' \geq i)$ by $Z_{i'} \times_{X_i} X'_i, X_{i'} \times_{X_i} X'_i, \{\sigma_{i'j} \times \mathrm{id}\}$, respectively. After applying this procedure, we see that, for each i, the morphism $X_i \longrightarrow X_{i-1}$ satisfies the conditions in Proposition 6.3 required for f'. So the morphism $X_d \xrightarrow{g} X_0$ and the divisors $Z_0 \subseteq X_0, Z_d \subseteq X_d$ have the following local expression: If we take $x \in X_d(\overline{k})$ and put $y := g(x) \in X_0(\overline{k})$, the homomorphism $g^* : \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_0,y} \longrightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_d,x}$ induced by g has the form

$$\begin{aligned}&\overline{k}[[t_1, \cdots, t_n]] \longrightarrow \\ &\overline{k}[[x_{ij}\,(1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq m_i), t_{r+1}, \cdots t_n, y_1, \cdots, y_l]]/(\prod_{j=1}^{m_i} x_{ij} - t_i\,(1 \leq i \leq r))\end{aligned}$$

for some $n, r, l \geq 0$ with $r \leq n$, and Z_0, Z_d have the form $Z_0 = \bigcup_{i=1}^r \{t_i = 0\}$, $Z_d = \bigcup_{i=1}^r (\bigcup_{j=1}^{m_i} \{x_{ij} = 0\}) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{l'} \{y_i = 0\}$ (for some $l' \leq l$). In this case, $g^{-1}(Z_0) \subseteq Z_d$ corresponds to the subscheme $\bigcup_{i=1}^r (\bigcup_{j=1}^{m_i} \{x_{ij} = 0\})$. So we see that $g^{-1}(Z_0) \subseteq X_d$ is also a normal crossing divisor. Moreover, if we denote the fine log structure on X_0 (resp. X_d) defined by Z_0 (resp. $g^{-1}(Z_0)$) by M_{X_0} (resp. M_{X_d}), we see from the above local expression that the morphism $(X_d, M_{X_d}) \longrightarrow (X_0, M_{X_0})$ is proper log smooth integral.

Summing up the above argument, we obtain the following proposition:

Proposition 6.4. *Let $f : X \longrightarrow S$ be a proper morphism of integral schemes such that the generic fiber is geometrically irreducible of dimension $d \geq 1$. Then we have the commutative diagram*

(6.2)
$$\begin{tikzcd} X \arrow[d, "f"'] & X_d \arrow[l, "\psi"'] \arrow[d, "g"] \\ S & X_0 \arrow[l] \end{tikzcd}$$

and an open subset $U_0 \subseteq X_0$ such that the horizontal arrows are alterations, $Z_0 := X_0 - U_0, Z_d := X_d - g^{-1}(U_0)$ are normal crossing divisors of regular schemes X_0, X_d respectively and that, if we denote the log structure on X_0 (resp. X_d) defined by Z_0 (resp. Z_d) by M_{X_0} (resp. M_{X_d}), the morphism $(X_d, M_{X_d}) \longrightarrow (X_0, M_{X_0})$ is proper log smooth integral.

Remark 6.5. Proposition 6.4 is true even for $d = 0$: Indeed, in the case $d = 0$, f is birational. So, if we take an alteration $X_0 \longrightarrow X$ with X_0 regular and if we put $X_d := X_0, g := \mathrm{id}, U_0 := X_0$, we have the diagram (6.2).

Remark 6.6. It is stated (without proofs) in [A-Kar] that the statement of Proposition 6.4 is shown in [dJ], but it seems that we need results in [dJ2]. We included the indication of the proof of the above proposition just because we could not find a proposition which states directly the content of the above proposition in the paper [dJ2].

In the rest of this section, we prove, for a given proper morphism of schemes $X \longrightarrow Y$, the existence of certain diagram involving hypercovering by 'nice' schemes, by using Proposition 6.4. To this end, first we introduce some notions on morphism of pairs and schemes and prove an elementary lemma. Recall ([Ch-T, 2.3.3]) that a morphism of pairs $f : (U_X, X) \longrightarrow (U_Y, Y)$ is called strict if we have $f^{-1}(U_Y) = U_X$. We introduce the following terminology for certain covering of pairs (cf. [T5]):

Definition 6.7. *A morphism of pairs $f : (U_X, X) \longrightarrow (U_Y, Y)$ is called a proper covering if f is strict, $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ is proper and $f : U_X \longrightarrow U_Y$ is proper surjective. Moreover, if $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ is also surjective, f is called a strongly proper covering. A hypercovering with respect to proper coverings is called a proper hypercovering. We can also define the notion of n-truncated proper hyperconvering in the same way.*

We also introduce the notion of a good proper surjective morphism and a good strongly proper covering as follows.

Definition 6.8. *A proper surjective morphism of schemes $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ is called good if f can be written as a composite of finite number of the morphisms of the following forms*:

1. *The morphism $\coprod_{i=1}^{n} Y_i \longrightarrow Y_{\mathrm{red}} \longrightarrow Y$ induced by the canonical inclusions, where $Y_{\mathrm{red}} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} Y_i$ is the decomposition of Y_{red} into connected components.*
2. *The morphism $\coprod_{i=1}^{n} f_i : \coprod_{i=1}^{n} X_i \longrightarrow \coprod_{i=1}^{n} Y_i$, where each $f_i : X_i \longrightarrow Y_i$ is an alteration* (*between integral schemes*).

A strongly proper covering $f : (U_X, X) \longrightarrow (U_Y, Y)$ is called good if $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ is good.

Note that a good proper surjective morphism $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ of integral schemes is necessarily an alteration. It is easy to see that a good proper surjective morphism $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ has the following properties:

1. If $Z \subseteq X$ is a closed subset such that $X - Z \subseteq X$ is dense, $f(Z) \subseteq X$ is also a closed subset such that $Y - f(Z) \subseteq Y$ is dense.
2. If $U \subseteq Y$ is an open dense subset, so is $f^{-1}(U) \subseteq X$.

Lemma 6.9. *Let $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ be a proper morphism of schemes and let $U \subseteq Y$ be a dense open subscheme. Then we have the diagram consisting of strict morphism* *of pairs*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(U_X, X) \arrow[d, "f"'] & (U_{X'}, X') \arrow[l, "g_X"'] \arrow[d, "f'"'] \\
(U_Y, Y) & (U_{Y'}, Y') \arrow[l, "g_Y"']
\end{tikzcd} \tag{6.3}$$

with $(U_{Y'}, Y') = \coprod_{j=1}^{b}(U_{Y'_j}, Y'_j)$, $(U_{X'}, X') = \coprod_{j=1}^{b}(\coprod_{i=1}^{r_j}(U_{X'_{ji}}, X'_{ji}))$ (*decomposition into connected components with* $f'(X'_{ji}) \subseteq Y'_j$) *satisfying the following conditions*:

1. U_Y *is contained in* U *and dense in* Y.
2. X'_{ji}*'s,* Y'_j*'s are integral.*
3. *The map* $\overline{g}_X : (U_{X'}, X') \longrightarrow (U_X \times_{U_Y} U_{Y'}, X \times_Y Y')$ *induced by* (g_X, f') *is a proper covering and the map* g_Y *is a good strongly proper covering.*
4. *For each* i, j, *the generic fiber of* $f'|_{X'_{ji}} : X'_{ji} \longrightarrow Y'_j$ *is non-empty and geometrically irreducible.* (*Attention*: *It is possible that* $r_j = 0$ *holds for some* j.)

Proof. First let $Y_{\mathrm{red}} = \bigcup_{j=1}^{b} Y_j$ be the decomposition of Y_{red} into irreducible components and let $f_j : X_j \longrightarrow Y_j$ be the base change of f by $Y_j \hookrightarrow Y_{\mathrm{red}} \hookrightarrow Y$. Then each Y_j is integral. Let η_j be the generic point of Y_j and Let X_{η_j} be the generic fiber of f_j. Then, there exists a finite map $\eta'_j \longrightarrow \eta_j$ of spectra of fields such that any irreducible component of $X_{\eta'_j} := X_{\eta_j} \times_{\eta_j} \eta'_j$ is geometrically irreducible. Then, let Y'_j be the normalization of Y_j in η'_j, put $X''_j := X_j \times_{Y_j} Y'_j$ and denote the map $X''_j \longrightarrow Y'_j$ by f''_j. Then η'_j is the generic point of Y'_j and the generic fiber of f''_j is $X_{\eta'_j}$. Note that the generic fiber $(X''_{j,\mathrm{red}})_{\eta'_j}$ of $f''_{j,\mathrm{red}} : X''_{j,\mathrm{red}} \hookrightarrow X''_j \xrightarrow{f''_j} Y'_j$ is isomorphic to $(X_{\eta'_j})_{\mathrm{red}}$. Let $\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_{r_j}$ be the generic points of $(X''_{j,\mathrm{red}})_{\eta'_j}$ and let $X'_{ji}\,(1 \leq i \leq r_j)$ be the closure of ξ_i in $X''_{j,\mathrm{red}}$. Then there exists a closed subscheme X''_{j0} of $X''_{j,\mathrm{red}}$ such that $X''_{j,\mathrm{red}} = X''_{j0} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{r_j} X'_{ji}$ holds and that $f''_{j,\mathrm{red}}(X''_{j0})$ is a proper closed subset of Y'_j. (Since Y'_j is integral, this implies that $Y'_j - f''_{j,\mathrm{red}}(X''_{j0})$ is dense in Y'_j.)

Now let us define $X', Y', f', g_X, g_Y, U_Y$ by

$$X' := \coprod_{j=1}^{b}\coprod_{i=1}^{r_j} X'_{ji}, \qquad Y' := \coprod_{j=1}^{b} Y'_j,$$

$$f' : \coprod_{j=1}^{b}\coprod_{i=1}^{r_j} X'_{ji} \hookrightarrow \coprod_{j=1}^{b} X''_{j,\mathrm{red}} \xrightarrow{\coprod_j f''_{j,\mathrm{red}}} \coprod_{j=1}^{b} Y'_j,$$

$$g_X : \coprod_{j=1}^{b}\coprod_{i=1}^{r_j} X'_{ji} \longrightarrow \coprod_{j=1}^{b} X''_{j,\mathrm{red}} \hookrightarrow \coprod_{j=1}^{b} X''_j \longrightarrow \coprod_{j} X_j \longrightarrow X,$$

$$g_Y : \coprod_{j=1}^{b} Y'_j \longrightarrow \coprod_{j=1}^{b} Y_j \longrightarrow Y,$$

$$U_Y := U \cap (Y - g_Y(\bigcup_j f''_{j,\mathrm{red}}(X''_{j0})))$$

and define the diagram (6.3) in order that the mophisms in (6.3) are all strict. Then one can check that all the required conditions are satisfied. So we are done. ☐

By using Proposition 6.4 and Lemma 6.9, we can prove the following proposition:

Proposition 6.10. *Let $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ be a proper morphism of schemes and let $U \subseteq Y$ be a dense open subscheme. Then we have the diagram consisting of strict morphism of pairs*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(U_X, X) \arrow[d, "f"'] & (U_{\widetilde{X}}, \widetilde{X}) \arrow[l, "g_X"'] \arrow[d, "\widetilde{f}"'] \\
(U_Y, Y) & (U_{\widetilde{Y}}, \widetilde{Y}) \arrow[l, "g_Y"']
\end{tikzcd} \tag{6.4}$$

satisfying the following conditions:

1. *U_Y is contained in U and dense in Y.*
2. *$\widetilde{Y}$ is regular.*
3. *The map $\overline{g}_X : (U_{\widetilde{X}}, \widetilde{X}) \longrightarrow (U_X \times_{U_Y} U_{\widetilde{Y}}, X \times_Y \widetilde{Y})$ induced by $(g_X, \widetilde{f})$ is a proper covering and the map g_Y is a good strongly proper covering.*
4. *There exist fine log structures $M_{\widetilde{X}}, M_{\widetilde{Y}}$ on $\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{Y}$ respectively such that $U_{\widetilde{X}} \subseteq (\widetilde{X}, M_{\widetilde{X}})_{\mathrm{triv}}, U_{\widetilde{Y}} \subseteq (\widetilde{Y}, M_{\widetilde{Y}})_{\mathrm{triv}}$ holds and that there exists a proper log smooth integral morphism having log smooth parameter $(\widetilde{X}, M_{\widetilde{X}}) \longrightarrow (\widetilde{Y}, M_{\widetilde{Y}})$ whose underlying morphism of schemes is the same as $\widetilde{f}$.*

Proof. First let us take the diagram consisting of strict morphism of pairs

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(V_X, X) \arrow[d, "f"'] & (U_{X'}, X') \arrow[l, "g_X"'] \arrow[d, "f'"'] \\
(V_Y, Y) & (U_{Y'}, Y') \arrow[l, "g_Y"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

satisfying the conclusion of Lemma 6.9, and let $Y' = \coprod_{j=1}^{b} Y'_j$, $X' := \coprod_{j=1}^{b}(\coprod_{i=1}^{r_j} X'_{ji})$ the decomposition of Y', X' into connected components with $f'(X'_{ji}) \subseteq Y'_j$.

Let us fix j. We prove the following claim:

claim For any $1 \leq s \leq r_j$, there exists a diagram consisting of strict morphism of pairs

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\coprod_{i=1}^{r_j}(X'_{ji}, O'_{X,ji}) \arrow[d, "f'"'] & \coprod_{i=1}^{r_j}(X''_{ji}, O''_{X,ji}) \arrow[l] \arrow[d, "f''"'] \\
(Y'_j, O'_{Y,j}) & (Y''_j, O''_{Y,j}) \arrow[l]
\end{tikzcd} \tag{6.5}$$

satisfying the following conditions:

1. $O'_{Y,j}$ is dense in Y'_j.
2. Y''_j is regular and connected (so it is integral).

(3) The upper horizontal arrow is a proper covering and the lower horizontal arrow is a good strongly proper covering. (This implies that the map $Y''_j \longrightarrow Y'_j$ is an alteration.)

(4) There exist fine log structures $M_{\coprod_{i=1}^s X''_{ji}}, M_{Y''_j}$ on $\coprod_{i=1}^s X''_{ji}, Y''_j$ respectively and a proper log smooth integral morphism having log smooth parameter $g : (\coprod_{i=1}^s X''_{ji}, M_{\coprod_{i=1}^s X''_{ji}}) \longrightarrow (Y''_j, M_{Y''_j})$ whose underlying morphism of schemes is $f''|_{\coprod_{i=1}^s X''_{ji}}$ such that $(Y''_j, M_{Y''_j})_{\mathrm{triv}}$ is dense open in Y''_j and that $g^{-1}((Y''_j, M_{Y''_j})_{\mathrm{triv}})$ is contained in $(\coprod_{i=1}^s X''_{ji}, M_{\coprod_{i=1}^s X''_{ji}})_{\mathrm{triv}}$.

(5) For each $i \geq s+1$, X''_{ji} is integral and the generic fiber of $f''|_{X''_{ji}} : X''_{ji} \longrightarrow Y''_j$ is non-empty and geometrically irreducible.

We prove the claim by induction on s: In the case $s = 1$, we apply Proposition 6.4 to the morphism $X'_{j1} \longrightarrow Y'_j$ to obtain the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X'_{j1} \arrow[d] & X''_{j1} \arrow[l] \arrow[d] \\
Y'_j & Y''_j \arrow[l]
\end{tikzcd}$$

satisfying the conclusion of Proposition 6.4. (In particular, Y''_j is regular, connected and we have fine log structures $M_{X''_{j1}}, M_{Y''_j}$ on X''_{j1}, Y''_j respectively and a proper log smooth integral morphism having log smooth parameter $g : (X''_{j1}, M_{X''_{j1}}) \longrightarrow (Y''_j, M_{Y''_j})$ whose underlying morphism of schemes is the same as the map $X''_{j1} \longrightarrow Y''_j$ in the above diagram such that $(Y''_j, M_{Y''_j})_{\mathrm{triv}}$ is dense open in Y''_j and that $g^{-1}((Y''_j, M_{Y''_j})_{\mathrm{triv}})$ is contained in $(X''_{j1}, M_{X''_{j1}})_{\mathrm{triv}}$.) On the other hand, for $i \geq 2$, the generic fiber of $X'_{ji} \longrightarrow Y'_j$ is geometrically irreducible. So there exists a unique generic point of $(X'_{ji} \times_{Y'_j} Y''_j)_{\mathrm{red}}$ (which we denote by ξ_{ji}) which is sent to the generic point of Y''_j by the morphism $(X'_{ji} \times_{Y'_j} Y''_j)_{\mathrm{red}} \longrightarrow Y''_j$. Let X''_{ji} be the closure of ξ_{ji} in $(X'_{ji} \times_{Y'_j} Y''_j)_{\mathrm{red}}$. Then there exists a closed subset C_{ji} in $(X'_{ji} \times_{Y'_j} Y''_j)_{\mathrm{red}}$ with $(X'_{ji} \times_{Y'_j} Y''_j)_{\mathrm{red}} = X''_{ji} \cup C_{ji}$ such that the image of C_{ji} in Y''_j is a proper closed subset of Y''_j. Then, if we put

$$O'_{Y,j} := Y'_j - \bigcup_{i=2}^{r_j} (\text{image of } C_{ji})$$

and define the diagram (6.5) in order that the morphisms are all strict, we can check that the diagram satisfies the required conditions. So we have proved the claim for $s = 1$.

If the claim is true for $s - 1$, we have the diagram consisting of strict morphisms of pairs

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\coprod_{i=1}^{r_j} (X'_{ji}, O'_{X,ji}) \arrow[d, "f'"'] & \coprod_{i=1}^{r_j} (X''_{ji}, O''_{X,ji}) \arrow[l] \arrow[d, "f''"'] \\
(Y'_j, O'_{Y',j}) & (Y''_j, O''_{Y,j}), \arrow[l]
\end{tikzcd} \tag{6.6}$$

fine log structures $M_{\coprod_{i=1}^{s-1} X''_{ji}}, M_{Y''_j}$ on $\coprod_{i=1}^{s-1} X''_{ji}, Y''_j$ respectively and a proper log smooth integral morphism having log smooth parameter $g : (\coprod_{i=1}^{s-1} X''_{ji}, M_{\coprod_{i=1}^{s-1} X''_{ji}}) \longrightarrow (Y''_j, M_{Y''_j})$ satisfying the properties stated in the claim. Then, by Proposition 6.4, we have the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X''_{js} & X'''_{js} \arrow[l] \arrow[d] \\
Y''_j \arrow[u, leftarrow] & Y'''_j. \arrow[l]
\end{tikzcd}$$

and fine log structures $M^1_{X'''_{js}}, M^1_{Y'''_j}$ on X'''_{js}, Y'''_j respectively, satisfying the conclusion of proposition 6.4. (In particular, Y'''_j is regular, connected and we have a proper log smooth integral morphism having log smooth parameter $g : (X'''_{js}, M_{X'''_{js}}) \longrightarrow (Y'''_j, M_{Y'''_j})$ whose underlying morphism of schemes is the same as the map $X'''_{js} \longrightarrow Y'''_j$ in the above diagram such that $(Y'''_j, M_{Y'''_j})_{\mathrm{triv}}$ is dense open in Y'''_j and that $g^{-1}((Y'''_j, M_{Y'''_j})_{\mathrm{triv}})$ is contained in $(X'''_{js}, M_{X'''_{js}})_{\mathrm{triv}}$.) Let $\coprod_{i=1}^{s-1} X'''_{ji} \longrightarrow Y'''_j$ be the base change of $\coprod_{i=1}^{s-1} X''_{ji} \longrightarrow Y''_j$ by $Y'''_j \longrightarrow Y''_j$ and let $M^2_{Y'''_j}, M^2_{\coprod_{i=1}^{s-1} X'''_{ji}}$ be the pull-back of $M_{Y''_j}, M_{\coprod_{i=1}^{s-1} X''_{ji}}$ to $Y'''_j, \coprod_{i=1}^{s-1} X'''_{ji}$, respectively. Then we have proper log smooth integral morphisms having log smooth parameter

$$(X'''_{js}, M^1_{X'''_{js}}) \longrightarrow (Y'''_j, M^1_{Y'''_j}),$$

$$(\coprod_{i=1}^{s-1} X'''_{ji}, M^2_{\coprod_{i=1}^{s-1} X'''_{ji}}) \longrightarrow (Y'''_j, M^2_{Y'''_j}).$$

Moreover, we see that $(Y'''_j, M^1_{Y'''_j})_{\mathrm{triv}}, (Y'''_j, M^2_{Y'''_j})_{\mathrm{triv}}$ are dense in Y'''_j and that the inverse images of them are contained in $(X'''_{js}, M^1_{X'''_{js}})_{\mathrm{triv}}, (\coprod_{i=1}^{s-1} X'''_{ji}, M^2_{\coprod_{i=1}^{s-1} X'''_{ji}})_{\mathrm{triv}}$ respectively. Now let us put

$$(Y'''_j, M_{Y'''_j}) := (Y''', M^1_{Y'''_j}) \times_{Y'''} (Y''', M^2_{Y'''_j}), \quad (X'''_{js}, M_{X'''_{js}}) := (X'''_{js}, M^1_{X'''_{js}}) \times_{Y'''} (Y''', M^2_{Y'''_j}),$$

$$(\coprod_{i=1}^{s-1} X'''_{ji}, M_{\coprod_{i=1}^{s-1} X'''_{ji}}) := (Y''', M^1_{Y'''_j}) \times_{Y'''} (\coprod_{i=1}^{s-1} X'''_{ji}, M^2_{\coprod_{i=1}^{s-1} X'''_{ji}}).$$

Then we have the morphism

$$(\coprod_{i=1}^{s-1} X'''_{ji}, M_{\coprod_{i=1}^{s-1} X'''_{ji}}) \coprod (X'''_{js}, M_{X'''_{js}}) \longrightarrow (Y'''_j, M_{Y'''_j}). \tag{6.7}$$

On the other hand, for $i \geq s+1$, define the closed subscheme X'''_{ji}, C_{ji} with $(X''_{ji} \times_{Y''_j} Y'''_j)_{\mathrm{red}} = X'''_{ji} \cup C_{ji}$ as in the case $s = 1$ (so that the image of C_{ji} in Y'''_j is a proper closed subset). Then we put

$$P'_{Y,j} := O'_{Y,j} \cap (Y'_j - \bigcup_{i=s+1}^{r_j} (\text{image of } C_{ji}))$$

and define the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\coprod_{i=1}^{r_j}(X'_{ji}, P'_{X,ji}) \arrow[d, "f'"'] & \coprod_{i=1}^{r_j}(X'''_{ji}, P'''_{X,ji}) \arrow[l] \arrow[d, "f''"'] \\
(Y'_j, P'_{Y,j}) & (Y'''_j, P'''_{Y,j}) \arrow[l]
\end{tikzcd}$$

in order that the morphisms of pairs are all strict. Then this diagram, together with the morphism (6.7) of log schemes, satisfies the required condition for s. So the claim is proved.

By the claim for $s = r_j$ (for each j), we see that there exists a diagram consisting of strict morphism of pairs

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(X', O'_X) \arrow[d, "f'"'] & (\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{O}_X) \arrow[l] \arrow[d, "\widetilde{f}"'] \\
(Y', O'_Y) & (\widetilde{Y}, \widetilde{O}_Y) \arrow[l]
\end{tikzcd}$$

and fine log structures $M_{\widetilde{X}}, M_{\widetilde{Y}}$ on $\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{Y}$ respectively, satisfying the following conditions:

(1) $O'_Y \subseteq Y'$ is dense open.
(2) $\widetilde{Y}$ is regular (hence it is a disjoint union of integral schemes).
(3) The upper horizontal arrow is a proper covering and the lower horizontal arrow is a good strongly proper covering. (This implies that the morphism $\widetilde{Y} \longrightarrow Y'$ is a disjoint union of alterations.)
(4) There exists a proper log smooth integral morphism having log smooth parameter $(\widetilde{X}, M_{\widetilde{X}}) \longrightarrow (\widetilde{Y}, M_{\widetilde{Y}})$ whose underlying morphism of schemes is the same as $\widetilde{f}$ such that $(\widetilde{Y}, M_{\widetilde{Y}})_{\text{triv}}$ is dense in $\widetilde{Y}$ and $\widetilde{f}^{-1}((\widetilde{Y}, M_{\widetilde{Y}})_{\text{triv}}) \subseteq (\widetilde{X}, M_{\widetilde{X}})_{\text{triv}}$ holds.

Now let η_j $(1 \leq j \leq b)$ be the generic point of Y'_j, let $\xi_{j1}, \cdots, \xi_{jr_j}$ be the generic points of X' over η_j and let η'_j be the generic point of $\widetilde{Y}$ over η_j. By the condition (3) in Lemma 6.9, $\xi_{ji} \times_{\eta_j} \eta'_j$ is irreducible. So $\{\xi_{ji} \times_{\eta_j} \eta'_j\}_{j,i}$ is bijective to the set of generic points of $X' \times_{Y'} \widetilde{Y}$ which are sent to one of the generic points of $\widetilde{Y}$ by second projection. Since $\widetilde{O}_X \longrightarrow O'_X$ is surjective and ξ_{ji}'s are contained in O'_X, there exists a point $\widetilde{\xi}_{ji}$ of $\widetilde{X}$ whose image in X' is ξ_{ji}. Then $\widetilde{\xi}_{ji}$ is sent to η_j by $\widetilde{X} \longrightarrow \widetilde{Y} \longrightarrow Y'$. By the property (3) above, η'_j is the unique point of $\widetilde{Y}$ which is sent to $\eta_j \in Y'$. So $\widetilde{\xi}_{ji}$ is sent to η'_j by $\widetilde{X} \longrightarrow \widetilde{Y}$. Hence $\widetilde{\xi}_{ji}$ is sent to $\xi_{ji} \times_{\eta_j} \eta'_j$ by the map $\widetilde{X} \longrightarrow X' \times_{Y'} \widetilde{Y}$. So the image of the map $\widetilde{X} \longrightarrow X' \times_{Y'} \widetilde{Y}$ contains the closure of $\{\xi_{ji} \times_{\eta_j} \eta'_j\}_{j,i}$. Therefore, we have a closed subset C of $X' \times_{Y'} \widetilde{Y}$ such that $X' \times_{Y'} \widetilde{Y} = (\text{image of } \widetilde{X}) \cup C$ holds and that the image of C in $\widetilde{Y}$ (which we denote by Z_1) is a closed subset of $\widetilde{Y}$ such that $\widetilde{Y} - Z_1$ is dense in $\widetilde{Y}$.

Now let $Z_2 := \widetilde{Y} - (\widetilde{Y}, M_{\widetilde{Y}})_{\text{triv}}$, define $U_Y \subseteq Y$ by

$$U_Y := Y - ((Y - V_Y) \cup (\text{image of } Z_1 \cup Z_2) \cup (\text{image of } Y' - O'_{Y'})),$$

and define the diagram (6.4) in order that the mophisms in (6.4) are all strict. Then one can check that all the required conditions are satisfied. So we are done. ☐

Now we prove our main theorem in this section:

Theorem 6.11. *Let $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ be a proper morphism of schemes and let $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we have the diagram consisting of strict morphism of pairs*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(U_X, X) \arrow[d, "f"'] & (U_{\widetilde{X}}, \widetilde{X}) \arrow[l] \arrow[d, "\widetilde{f}"'] & (U_{\widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)}}, \widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)}) \arrow[l, "h"'] \arrow[d, "\widetilde{f}^{(\bullet)}"'] \\
(U_Y, Y) & (U_{\widetilde{Y}}, \widetilde{Y}) \arrow[l, "g_Y"'] \arrow[r, equal] & (U_{\widetilde{Y}}, \widetilde{Y})
\end{tikzcd} \tag{6.8}$$

satisfying the following conditions:

1. *U_Y is dense in Y.*
2. *$\widetilde{Y}$ is regular.*
3. *The left square is Cartesian, g_Y is a good strongly proper covering and h is a q-truncated proper hypercovering by a q-truncated split simplicial pair.*
4. *There exist fine log structures $M_{\widetilde{X}^{(n)}}, M_{\widetilde{Y}}$ on $\widetilde{X}^{(n)}, \widetilde{Y}$ respectively $(n \leq q)$ such that $U_{\widetilde{X}^{(n)}} \subseteq (\widetilde{X}^{(n)}, M_{\widetilde{X}^{(n)}})_{\mathrm{triv}}, U_{\widetilde{Y}} \subseteq (\widetilde{Y}, M_{\widetilde{Y}})_{\mathrm{triv}}$ holds and that for each $n \leq q$, there exists a proper log smooth integral morphism having log smooth parameter $(\widetilde{X}^{(n)}, M_{\widetilde{X}^{(n)}}) \longrightarrow (\widetilde{Y}, M_{\widetilde{Y}})$ whose underlying morphism of schemes is the same as $\widetilde{f}^{(n)}$.*

Proof. We prove the theorem by induction on q. When $q = 0$ holds, let us take a diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(U_X, X) \arrow[d, "f"'] & (U_{\widetilde{X}^{(0)}}, \widetilde{X}^{(0)}) \arrow[l] \arrow[d, "\widetilde{f}^{(0)}"'] \\
(U_Y, Y) & (U_{\widetilde{Y}}, \widetilde{Y}) \arrow[l, "g_Y"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

satisfying the conclusion of Proposition 6.10. Then, if we put $(U_{\widetilde{X}}, \widetilde{X}) := (U_X \times_{U_Y} U_{\widetilde{Y}}, X \times_Y \widetilde{Y})$, we obtain the required diagram.

Now let us assume that the theorem is true for q, and take the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(U_X, X) \arrow[d, "f"'] & (U_{X'}, X') \arrow[l] \arrow[d, "f'"'] & (U_{X'^{(\bullet)}}, X'^{(\bullet)}) \arrow[l, "h"'] \arrow[d, "f'^{(\bullet)}"'] \\
(U_Y, Y) & (U_{Y'}, Y') \arrow[l, "g_Y"'] \arrow[r, equal] & (U_{Y'}, Y')
\end{tikzcd}$$

satisfying the conclusion of the theorem for q. Then put $C := \mathrm{cosk}_q^{X'}(X'^{(\bullet)})^{(q+1)}$ and starting from the morphism $C \longrightarrow Y'$, let us take a diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(V_C, C) \arrow[d] & (V_{\widetilde{X}^{(q+1)'}}, \widetilde{X}^{(q+1)'}) \arrow[l] \arrow[d] \\
(V_{Y'}, Y') & (V_{\widetilde{Y}}, \widetilde{Y}) \arrow[l]
\end{tikzcd}$$

satisfying the conclusion of Proposition 6.10. Now let us put $\widetilde{X} := X' \times_{Y'} \widetilde{Y}, \widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)} := X'^{(\bullet)} \times_{Y'} \widetilde{Y}\,(\bullet \leq q)$, $\widetilde{C} := C \times_{Y'} \widetilde{Y} = \operatorname{cosk}_q^{\widetilde{X}}(\widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)})^{(q+1)}$. Let us replace U_Y by $Y - ((\text{image of } Y' - V_{Y'}) \cup (Y - U_Y))$, define the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(U_X, X) \arrow[d, "f"'] & (U_{\widetilde{X}}, \widetilde{X}) \arrow[l] \arrow[d, "\widetilde{f}"'] & (U_{\widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)}}, \widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)}) \arrow[l, "h"'] \arrow[d, "\widetilde{f}^{(\bullet)}"'] \\
(U_Y, Y) & (U_{\widetilde{Y}}, \widetilde{Y}) \arrow[l, "g_Y"'] \arrow[r, equal] & (U_{\widetilde{Y}}, \widetilde{Y})
\end{tikzcd} \tag{6.9}$$

in order that the mophisms in the diagram are all strict, and define $U_{\widetilde{C}}, U_{\widetilde{X}^{(q+1)'}}$ by $U_{\widetilde{C}} := \widetilde{C} \times_Y U_Y, U_{\widetilde{X}^{(q+1)'}} := \widetilde{X}^{(q+1)'} \times_Y U_Y$. Then the diagram (6.9) satisfies the required condition for q and we have a proper covering $(U_{\widetilde{X}^{(q+1)'}}, \widetilde{X}^{(q+1)'}) \longrightarrow (U_{\widetilde{C}}, \widetilde{C})$ over $(U_{\widetilde{Y}}, \widetilde{Y})$. Then, by using the recipe of [SD, 5.1.3](=[T5, 7.2.5]), we can form a $(q+1)$-truncated split simplicial pair $(U_{\widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)}}, \widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)})$ which fits into the diagram like (6.9) ($\bullet$ runs through $0 \leq \bullet \leq q+1$ now), and we see that it satisfies the required condition for $q+1$. So the proof of the theorem is finished. $\square$

7. Relative rigid cohomology (II): general case

In this section, we prove (a version of) Berthelot's conjecture on the overconvergence of relative rigid cohomology of proper smooth morphisms (Conjecture 0.2) under mild assumption. We also prove the generic overconvergence for proper morphisms which are not necessarily smooth.

In this section, $B, \mathcal{B}$ are as in the previous section: Namely, $B = \operatorname{Spec} k$ and $\mathcal{B} = \operatorname{Spf} W(k)$, where k is a perfect field of characteristic p.

Before the proof, we need to prove the descent property of the category of overconvergent isocrystals for strongly proper Čech hypercovering. First we prove a lemma, which is essentially due to Ogus [O1, 4.15]:

Lemma 7.1. *Let N, a be positive integers and let us assume given the following diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\overline{Y}' \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "f"'] & (\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^a \arrow[d, "g"'] \\
\overline{Y} \arrow[r] & \mathcal{Y},
\end{tikzcd} \tag{7.1}$$

where the horizontal arrows are closed immersions, f is a projective surjective morphism between reduced B-schemes, $\mathcal{Y}$ is a flat formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme, $(\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^a$ is the a-fold fiber product of $\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}}$ over $\mathcal{Y}$ and g is the natural morphism. Then, for any $m > 0$, there exists $n > 0$ such that, for any $n' \geq n$, the morphism $(g_K)^{-1}(T_{m,1}(\mathcal{Y})_K) \cap T_{n',1}((\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^a)_K \longrightarrow T_{m,1}(\mathcal{Y})_K$ induced by g_K is surjective.

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on a. In the case $a = 1$, the lemma is proven in [O1, 4.15]. In general case, we factor the diagram (7.1) as follows:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\overline{Y}' \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "f_1"'] & (\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^a \arrow[d, "g_1"'] \\
\overline{Y}'' \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "f_2"'] & (\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^{a-1} \arrow[d, "g_2"'] \\
\overline{Y} \arrow[r] & \mathcal{Y},
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\overline{Y}''$ denotes the image of $\overline{Y}' \to (\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^a \to (\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^{a-1}$. Then we can use the induction hypothesis: So, for any $m > 0$, there exist k and n such that for any $n' \geq n$, we have surjections

$$(g_{2,K}^{-1})(T_{m,1}(\mathcal{Y})_K) \cap T_{k,1}((\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^{a-1}_K) \longrightarrow T_{m,1}(\mathcal{Y})_K,$$

$$(g_{1,K}^{-1})(T_{k,1}(\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^{a-1}_K) \cap T_{n',1}((\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^a_K) \longrightarrow T_{k,1}((\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^{a-1})_K.$$

From these surjections, we obtain the assertion. □

Corollary 7.2. *Let N, a be positive integers and let us assume given the following diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\overline{Y}' \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "f"'] & (\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^a \arrow[d, "g"'] \\
\overline{Y} \arrow[r] & \mathcal{Y},
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the upper horizontal arrow is a closed immersion, the lower horizontal arrow is a homeomorphic closed immersion, f is a projective surjective morphism between B-schemes, $\mathcal{Y}$ is a formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme, $(\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^a$ is the a-fold fiber product of $\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}}$ over $\mathcal{Y}$ and g is the natural morphism. Then there exists $n > 0$ such that, for any $n' \geq n$, the morphism $T_{n',1}((\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^a)_K \longrightarrow \mathcal{Y}_K$ induced by g_K is surjective.

Proof. By dividing $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ by the ideal of p-torsions, we may assume that $\mathcal{Y}$ is flat over $\mathcal{B}$. (This does not change the morphism g_K.) Moreover, we may replace f by $f_{\text{red}} : \overline{Y}'_{\text{red}} \longrightarrow \overline{Y}_{\text{red}}$ because the inductive system of admissible open sets $\{T_{n,1}((\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^a)_K\}_n$ are unchanged up to canonical isomorphism as inductive systems. Then the corollary is a special case of Lemma 7.1. □

Now we prove the descent property of the category of overconvergent isocrystals for strongly proper Čech hypercovering.

Proposition 7.3. *Let $(Y, \overline{Y}) \overset{g^{(\bullet)}}{\longleftarrow} (Y^{(\bullet)}, \overline{Y}^{(\bullet)})$ be a strongly proper Čech hypercovering of pairs over a B-scheme S and let $S \hookrightarrow \mathcal{S}$ be a closed immersion into a formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme $\mathcal{S}$. Then, if we denote the category of descent data with respect to $I^\dagger((Y^{(n)}, \overline{Y}^{(n)})/\mathcal{S}_K)$ $(n = 0, 1, 2)$ by $I^\dagger((Y^{(\bullet)}, \overline{Y}^{(\bullet)})/\mathcal{S}_K)$, the restriction functor*

$$I^\dagger((Y, \overline{Y})/\mathcal{S}_K) \longrightarrow I^\dagger((Y^{(\bullet)}, \overline{Y}^{(\bullet)})/\mathcal{S}_K)$$

is an equivalence of categories.

Proof. Since we may work locally on $\overline{Y}$, we may assume that $\overline{Y}$ admits a closed immersion $i : \overline{Y} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ such that $\mathcal{Y}$ is formally smooth over $\mathcal{S}$. By Chow's lemma, we can take a morphism $h : \overline{Z} \longrightarrow \overline{Y}^{(0)}$ such that both h and $g^{(0)} \circ h$ are projective surjective morphisms. Since the proposition for the strongly proper Čech hypercoverings induced by h and $g^{(0)} \circ h$ implies the proposition for $g^{(\bullet)}$, we may assume that $g^{(0)}$ is projective to prove the proposition. So we may assume that there exists a closed immersion $i^{(0)} : \overline{Y}^{(0)} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}}$ over i. Then, by taking fiber products, we obtain the following diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\overline{Y}^{(\bullet)} \arrow[r, "i^{(\bullet)}"] \arrow[d, "g^{(\bullet)}"'] & (\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^{\bullet+1} \arrow[d] \\
\overline{Y} \arrow[r, "i"] & \mathcal{Y}.
\end{tikzcd} \tag{7.2}$$

Let us denote the category of descent data for $I^\dagger((Y^{(n)}, \overline{Y}^{(n)})/\mathcal{S}, (\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^{n+1})\,(n = 0, 1, 2)$ by $I^\dagger((Y^{(\bullet)}, \overline{Y}^{(\bullet)})/\mathcal{S}, (\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^{\bullet+1})$. Then it suffices to prove that the restriction functor

$$I^\dagger((Y, \overline{Y})/\mathcal{S}_K, \mathcal{Y}) \longrightarrow I^\dagger((Y^{(\bullet)}, \overline{Y}^{(\bullet)})/\mathcal{S}_K, (\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^{\bullet+1})$$

is an equivalence of categories.

For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{Y}^m$ be the m-fold fiber product of $\mathcal{Y}$ over $\mathcal{S}$. Then, by taking fiber products, we obtain the following diagram from the diagram (7.2), where $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Y}^m$:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\overline{Y}^{(\bullet)} \arrow[r, "i^{(\bullet)}"] \arrow[d, "g^{(\bullet)}"'] & (\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Z}})^{m(\bullet+1)} \arrow[d] \\
\overline{Y} \arrow[r, "i"] & \mathcal{Z}.
\end{tikzcd} \tag{7.3}$$

Since the category $I^\dagger((Y, \overline{Y})/\mathcal{S}_K, \mathcal{Y})$ (resp. $I^\dagger((Y^{(\bullet)}, \overline{Y}^{(\bullet)})/\mathcal{S}_K, (\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^{\bullet+1})$) is defined as the category of coherent $j^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{Y}[_{\mathcal{Y}}}$-modules (resp. coherent $j^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{Y}^{(\bullet)}[_{(\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}})^{\bullet+1}}}$-modules) endowed with an isomorphism between pull-backs on $]\overline{Y}[_{\mathcal{Y}^2}$ (resp. $]\overline{Y}^{(\bullet)}[_{(\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}^2})^{2(\bullet+1)}}$) satisfying the cocycle condition on $]\overline{Y}[_{\mathcal{Y}^3}$ (resp. $]\overline{Y}^{(\bullet)}[_{(\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Y}^3})^{3(\bullet+1)}}$). So, to prove the proposition, it suffices to prove the descent for coherent modules, that is, it suffices to prove that the restriction functor

$$\mathrm{Coh}(j^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{Y}[_{\mathcal{Z}}}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Coh}(j^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{Y}^{(\bullet)}[_{(\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Z}})^{m(\bullet+1)}}})$$

is an equivalence of categories for $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Y}^m$, where $\mathrm{Coh}(j^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{Y}^{(\bullet)}[_{(\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Z}})^{m(\bullet+1)}}})$ denotes the category of descent data with respect to $\mathrm{Coh}(j^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{Y}^{(n)}[_{(\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Z}})^{m(n+1)}}})\,(n = 0, 1, 2)$. To prove this, it suffices to prove the same assertion after we pull-back the diagram (7.3) by $T_{l,1}(\mathcal{Z}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}\,(l \in \mathbb{N})$. So we may assume that i is a homeomorphic closed immersion. (But we do not assume anymore that $\mathcal{Z}$ is equal to $\mathcal{Y}^m$.) Moreover, we may assume that $\mathcal{Z}$ is affine.

By Corollary 7.2, there exists a surjection $T_{k,1}((\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Z}})^m)_K \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}_K$ for some k. Let $T_{k,1}((\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Z}})^m)^{\bullet}$ be the $\bullet$-fold fiber product of $T_{k,1}((\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Z}})^m)$ over $\mathcal{Z}$. Then $T_{k,1}((\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Z}})^m)^{\bullet+1}_K$ is an admissible open set of $]\overline{Y}^{(\bullet)}[_{(\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Z}})^{m(\bullet+1)}}$. Let $g_1, \cdots, g_c \in \Gamma(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}})$ be a lift of generators of $\Gamma(\overline{Y}, \mathrm{Ker}(\mathcal{O}_{\overline{Y}} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\overline{Y}-Y}))$, and for $\nu \in p^{\mathbb{Q}_{<0}}$, let us define the admissible open set $\mathcal{Z}_{K,\nu}$ (resp. $T_{k,1}((\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Z}})^m)^{\bullet}_{K,\nu}$) of $\mathcal{Z}_K$ (resp. $T_{k,1}((\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Z}})^m)^{\bullet}_K$) as the set $\bigcup_{j=1}^c \{|g_j| \geq \nu\}$.

Now assume that we are given an object $E^{(\bullet)}$ in $\mathrm{Coh}(j^{\dagger}\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{Y}^{(\bullet)}[_{(\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Z}})^{m(\bullet+1)}}})$. Then, for ν sufficiently close to 1, $E^{(\bullet)}$ defines a compatible family (with respect to $0 \leq \bullet \leq 2$) of coherent modules on $T_{k,1}((\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Z}})^m)^{\bullet+1}_{K,\nu}$. To show the assertion, it suffices to prove that it descents to a coherent module on $\mathcal{Y}_{\nu,K}$. That is, it suffices to prove the descent property of coherent modules for the map

$$T_{k,1}((\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Z}})^m)^{\bullet+1}_{K,\nu} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{K,\nu}. \tag{7.4}$$

Note that this map is obtained as the pull-back from the Čech covering induced by the analytically flat, analytically surjective map of formal schemes $T_{k,1}((\mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{Z}})^m) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$. So, by any affinoid admissible open set $\mathcal{Q}_K$ of $\mathcal{Z}_{K,\nu}$, the pull-back of the map (7.4) by $\mathcal{Q}_K \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{K,\nu}$ is the Čech covering induced by an analytically flat, analytically surjective map of formal schemes. So the descent of coherent module for this map is true due to the rigid analytic faithfully flat descent of Gabber. So we have finished the proof of the proposition. □

Now we prove our main theorem on the generic overconvergence for proper morphisms.

Theorem 7.4. *Take a triple of the form $(S, S, \mathcal{S})$ and let us assume given the diagram*

$$(X, \overline{X}) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, \overline{Y}) \xrightarrow{g} (S, S), \tag{7.5}$$

where f is a strict proper morphism of pairs and g is a morphism of pairs. Then, there exists a non-empty open set U_Y of Y, a diagram

$$\overline{Y} \xleftarrow{g_Y} \widetilde{Y} \overset{i}{\hookrightarrow} \mathcal{Y}$$

(where g_Y is a composition of an etale surjective map and a proper surjective map and i is a closed immersion into a p-adic formal scheme formally smooth over $\mathcal{S}$), such that, for any locally free overconvergent isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ on $(X, \overline{X})/\mathcal{S}$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists the unique overconvergent isocrystal $\mathcal{F}$ on $(U_Y, \overline{Y})/\mathcal{S}_K$ satisfying the following condition: For any triple $(Z, \overline{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ over $(U_{\widetilde{Y}}, \widetilde{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ (where $U_{\widetilde{Y}} := U_Y \times_{\overline{Y}} \widetilde{Y}$) satisfying $Z = U_{\widetilde{Y}} \times_{\widetilde{Y}} \overline{Z}$ with $\mathcal{Z}$ formally smooth over $\mathcal{Y}$, the restriction of $\mathcal{F}$ to $I^{\dagger}((Z, \overline{Z})/\mathcal{S}_K, \mathcal{Z})$ is given functorially by $(R^q f_{(X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}, \epsilon)$, where ϵ is an isomorphism

$$p_2^* R^q f_{(X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E} \overset{\sim}{\rightarrow} R^q f_{(X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z} \times_{\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E} \overset{\sim}{\leftarrow} p_1^* R^q f_{(X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}$$

(p_i denotes the i-th projection $]\overline{Z}[_{\mathcal{Z}\times_{\mathcal{S}}\mathcal{Z}} \longrightarrow]\overline{Z}[_{\mathcal{Z}}$).

Proof. First we prove the following boundedness property (this is essentially the same as [T5, 6.4.1]): There exists a positive integer q_0 such that, for any overconvergent isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ on $(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{S}_K$ and any $(Y,\overline{Y})$-triple $(Z,\overline{Z},\mathcal{Z})$ over $(S,S,\mathcal{S})$, we have

$$R^q f_{(X\times_Y Z, \overline{X}\times_{\overline{Y}}\overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E} = 0 \tag{7.6}$$

for any $q > q_0$. To prove this, it suffices to check the equality (7.6) (for q sufficiently large) in the case where $\overline{Y}$ and $\mathcal{Z}$ are affine, and by [T5, 6.3.2], we may assume that $\overline{X}$ is affine. Then there exists a closed immersion $\overline{X}\times_{\overline{Y}}\overline{Z} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}$ such that $\mathcal{P}$ is formally smooth over $\mathcal{Z}$. Let us denote the morphism $]\overline{X}\times_{\overline{Y}}\overline{Z}[_{\mathcal{P}} \longrightarrow]\overline{Z}[_{\mathcal{Z}}$ by φ. Then we have the spectral sequence

$$E_1^{s,t} = R^t\varphi_*(E\otimes_{j^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}\times_{\overline{Y}}\overline{Z}[_{\mathcal{P}}}} j^\dagger\Omega^s_{]\overline{X}\times_{\overline{Y}}\overline{Z}[_{\mathcal{P}}/]\overline{Z}[_{\mathcal{Z}}}) \Longrightarrow R^{s+t}f_{(X\times_Y Z,\overline{X}\times_{\overline{Y}}\overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E},$$

where E denotes the coherent $j^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{X}\times_{\overline{Y}}\overline{Z}[_{\mathcal{P}}}$-module associated to $\mathcal{E}$. Then, by [T5, 3.2.2 (i)(ii)], the $E_1^{s,t}$-term is equal to zero for $t > 1$ or sufficiently large s. So we have the claim. By this claim, it suffices to treat only the case $0 \le q \le q_0$ to prove the theorem. (So we assume this.)

Put $N := q_0(q_0+1)/2$ and let us take a diagram consisting of strict morphism of pairs

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(U_X,\overline{X}) \arrow[d, "f"'] & (U_{\widetilde{X}'},\widetilde{X}') \arrow[l] \arrow[d, "\widetilde{f}"'] & (U_{\widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)'}},\widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)'}) \arrow[l, "h'"'] \arrow[d, "\widetilde{f}^{(\bullet)'}"'] \\
(U_Y,\overline{Y}) & (U_{\widetilde{Y}'},\widetilde{Y}') \arrow[l, "g'_Y"'] \arrow[r, equal] & (U_{\widetilde{Y}'},\widetilde{Y}')
\end{tikzcd}$$

satisfying the conclusion of Theorem 6.11 (but q is replaced by N): Then there exist fine log structures $M_{\widetilde{X}^{(n)'}}, M_{\widetilde{Y}'}$ on $\widetilde{X}^{(n)'}, \widetilde{Y}'$ respectively ($n \le N$) such that $U_{\widetilde{X}^{(n)'}} \subseteq (\widetilde{X}^{(n)'}, M_{\widetilde{X}^{(n)'}})_{\mathrm{triv}}, U_{\widetilde{Y}} \subseteq (\widetilde{Y}', M_{\widetilde{Y}'})_{\mathrm{triv}}$ holds and that for each $n \le N$, there exists a proper log smooth integral morphism having log smooth parameter $(\widetilde{X}^{(n)'}, M_{\widetilde{X}^{(n)'}}) \longrightarrow (\widetilde{Y}', M_{\widetilde{Y}'})$ whose underlying morphism of schemes is the same as $\widetilde{f}^{(n)'}$. Then let us take a strict etale covering $g''_Y : (\widetilde{Y}, M_{\widetilde{Y}}) \longrightarrow (\widetilde{Y}', M_{\widetilde{Y}'})$ and a closed immersion $i : (\widetilde{Y}, M_{\widetilde{Y}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ such that the inverse image $U_{\widetilde{Y}}$ of U_Y in $\widetilde{Y}$ is contained in $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})_{\mathrm{triv}}$, $(\mathcal{Y}, M_{\mathcal{Y}})$ is formally log smooth over $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ is formally smooth over $\mathcal{S}$. Put $g_Y := g''_Y \circ g'_Y$ and let us denote the base change of the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(U_{\widetilde{X}'},\widetilde{X}') \arrow[d, "\widetilde{f}"'] & (U_{\widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)'}},\widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)'}) \arrow[l, "h'"'] \arrow[d, "\widetilde{f}^{(\bullet)'}"'] \\
(U_{\widetilde{Y}'},\widetilde{Y}') \arrow[r, equal] & (U_{\widetilde{Y}'},\widetilde{Y}')
\end{tikzcd}$$

by $g''_Y : (U_{\widetilde{Y}}, \widetilde{Y}) \longrightarrow (U_{\widetilde{Y}'}, \widetilde{Y}')$ by

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(U_{\widetilde{X}}, \widetilde{X}) \arrow[d, "\widetilde{f}"'] & (U_{\widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)}}, \widetilde{X^{(\bullet)}}) \arrow[l] \arrow[d, "\widetilde{f}^{(\bullet)\prime}"'] \\
(U_{\widetilde{Y}}, \widetilde{Y}) \arrow[r, equal] & (U_{\widetilde{Y}}, \widetilde{Y}).
\end{tikzcd}$$

Then we obtain the diagram consisting of strict morphism of pairs

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(U_X, \overline{X}) \arrow[d, "f"'] & (U_{\widetilde{X}}, \widetilde{X}) \arrow[l] \arrow[d, "\widetilde{f}"'] & (U_{\widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)}}, \widetilde{X^{(\bullet)}}) \arrow[l] \arrow[d, "\widetilde{f}^{(\bullet)}"'] \\
(U_Y, \overline{Y}) & (U_{\widetilde{Y}}, \widetilde{Y}) \arrow[l, "g_Y"'] \arrow[r, equal] & (U_{\widetilde{Y}}, \widetilde{Y})
\end{tikzcd} \tag{7.7}$$

satisfying the conditions in Theorem 6.11 (q is replaced by N) except that g_Y is now a composition of an etale surjective map and a proper surjective map. Let us replace U_Y by $Y \cap U_Y$ and make the diagram (7.7) in order that all the morphisms are strict. (Then U_Y is no more dense in $\widetilde{Y}$ but only non-empty.) Let us define the simplicial scheme $\check{X}^{(\bullet)}$ by $\check{X}^{(\bullet)} := \mathrm{cosk}_N^{\widetilde{X}}(\widetilde{X^{(\bullet)}})$ and let $U_{\check{X}^{(\bullet)}}$ be the inverse image of U_Y in $\check{X}^{(\bullet)}$. (Then the N-truncation of $(U_{\check{X}^{(\bullet)}}, \check{X}^{(\bullet)})$ is nothing but $(U_{\widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)}}, \widetilde{X^{(\bullet)}})$.) Then, since $(U_{\check{X}^{(\bullet)}}, \check{X}^{(\bullet)}) \longrightarrow (U_{\widetilde{X}}, \widetilde{X})$ is a proper hypercovering, we have the spectral sequence of relative rigid cohomology

$$E_1^{s,t} := R^t f_{(U_{\check{X}^{(s)}}, \check{X}^{(s)})/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E} \Longrightarrow R^{s+t} f_{(U_{\widetilde{X}}, \widetilde{X})/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E} \tag{7.8}$$

established by Tsuzuki (see [T5]). Then, for $s \le N$, the $E_1^{s,t}$-term $R^t f_{(U_{\check{X}^{(s)}}, \check{X}^{(s)})/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{rig}*} \mathcal{E} = R^t f_{(U_{\widetilde{X}^{(s)}}, \widetilde{X}^{(s)})/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}$ is a coherent $j^\dagger \mathcal{O}_{]\widetilde{Y}[_\mathcal{Y}}$-module (where j is the admissible open immersion $]U_{\widetilde{Y}}[_\mathcal{Y} \hookrightarrow]\widetilde{Y}[_\mathcal{Y})$ by Theorem 5.1. So, by the spectral sequence (7.8), we see that $R^q f_{(U_{\widetilde{X}}, \widetilde{X})/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}$ is also a coherent $j^\dagger \mathcal{O}_{]\widetilde{Y}[_\mathcal{Y}}$-module. By the same reason, $R^q f_{(U_{\widetilde{X}}, \widetilde{X})/\mathcal{Y}\times_\mathcal{S}\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}$ is also a coherent $j^\dagger \mathcal{O}_{]\widetilde{Y}[_\mathcal{Y}}$-module. Then, by the base change theorem by Tsuzuki [T3, 2.3.1], the morphisms $p_i^* R^q f_{(U_{\widetilde{X}}, \widetilde{X})/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E} \longrightarrow R^q f_{(U_{\widetilde{X}}, \widetilde{X})/\mathcal{Y}\times_\mathcal{S}\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}$ for $i = 1, 2$ are isomorphisms, where p_i denotes the i-th projection $]\widetilde{Y}[_{\mathcal{Y}\times_\mathcal{S}\mathcal{Y}} \longrightarrow]\widetilde{Y}[_\mathcal{Y}$. if we define $\epsilon^{\langle 0 \rangle}$ to be the isomorphism

$$p_2^* R^q f_{(U_{\widetilde{X}}, \widetilde{X})/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E} \overset{=}{\rightarrow} R^q f_{(U_{\widetilde{X}}, \widetilde{X})/\mathcal{Y}\times_\mathcal{S}\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E} \overset{=}{\leftarrow} p_1^* R^q f_{(U_{\widetilde{X}}, \widetilde{X})/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E},$$

then $\mathcal{F}^{\langle 0 \rangle} := (R^q f_{(U_{\widetilde{X}}, \widetilde{X})/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}, \epsilon^{\langle 0 \rangle})$ defines an overconvergent isocrystal on $(U_{\widetilde{Y}}, \widetilde{Y})/\mathcal{S}_K$.

Now, for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\widetilde{Y}^{\langle m \rangle}$ (resp. $\mathcal{Y}^{\langle m \rangle}$) be the $(m+1)$-fold fiber product of $\widetilde{Y}$ (resp. $\mathcal{Y}$) over $\overline{Y}$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}$), let $U_{\widetilde{Y}^{\langle m \rangle}}$ be the inverse image of U_Y by $\widetilde{Y}^{\langle m \rangle} \longrightarrow \overline{Y}$ and let $(U_{\widetilde{X}^{\langle m \rangle}}, \widetilde{X}^{\langle m \rangle})$ be $(U_X \times_{U_Y} U_{\widetilde{Y}^{\langle m \rangle}}, \overline{X} \times_Y \widetilde{Y}^{\langle m \rangle})$. If we choose one of the projections $\widetilde{Y}^{\langle m \rangle} \longrightarrow \widetilde{Y}$ and if we put $(U_{\widetilde{X}^{\langle m \rangle,(\bullet)}}, \widetilde{X}^{\langle m \rangle,(\bullet)}) := (U_{\widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)}} \times_{U_{\widetilde{Y}}} U_{\widetilde{Y}^{\langle m \rangle}}, \widetilde{X^{(\bullet)}} \times_{\widetilde{Y}} \widetilde{Y}^{\langle m \rangle})$, the morphism $(U_{\widetilde{X}^{\langle m\rangle,(\bullet)}}, \widetilde{X}^{\langle m\rangle,(\bullet)}) \longrightarrow (U_{\widetilde{X}^{\langle m\rangle}}, \widetilde{X}^{\langle m\rangle})$ is an N-truncated proper hypercovering and the morphism $\widetilde{X}^{\langle m\rangle,(n)} \longrightarrow \widetilde{Y}^{\langle m\rangle}$ $(n \leq N)$ admits log structures (pull-back log structures from $\widetilde{X}^{(n)}, \widetilde{Y}$) which makes this morphism a proper log smooth integral morphism having log smooth parameter. So, by the argument using the spectral sequence like (7.8), we see that $R^q f_{(U_{\widetilde{X}^{\langle m\rangle}}, \widetilde{X}^{\langle m\rangle})/\mathcal{Y}^{\langle m\rangle}, \mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}$ is a coherent $j^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{]\widetilde{Y}^{\langle m\rangle}[_{\mathcal{Y}^{\langle m\rangle}}}$-module and $R^q f_{(U_{\widetilde{X}^{\langle m\rangle}}, \widetilde{X}^{\langle m\rangle})/\mathcal{Y}^{\langle m\rangle}\times_{\mathcal{S}}\mathcal{Y}^{\langle m\rangle}, \mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}$ is a coherent $j^\dagger\mathcal{O}_{]\widetilde{Y}^{\langle m\rangle}[_{\mathcal{Y}^{\langle m\rangle}\times_{\mathcal{S}}\mathcal{Y}^{\langle m\rangle}}}$-module for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, by [T3, 2.3.1], they naturally defines an overconvergent isocrystal $\mathcal{F}^{\langle m\rangle}$ of the form $(R^q f_{(U_{\widetilde{X}^{\langle m\rangle}}, \widetilde{X}^{\langle m\rangle})/\mathcal{Y}^{\langle m\rangle}, \mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}, \epsilon^{\langle m\rangle})$ on $(U_{\widetilde{Y}^{\langle m\rangle}}, \widetilde{Y}^{\langle m\rangle})/\mathcal{S}_K$. Again by [T3, 2.3.1], $\mathcal{F}^{\langle m\rangle}$ is compatible with respsect to m. So $\mathcal{F}^{\langle\bullet\rangle}$ defines an object of $I^\dagger((U_{\widetilde{Y}^{\langle\bullet\rangle}}, \widetilde{Y}^{\langle\bullet\rangle})/\mathcal{S}_K)$, where $I^\dagger((U_{\widetilde{Y}^{\langle\bullet\rangle}}, \widetilde{Y}^{\langle\bullet\rangle})/\mathcal{S}_K)$ denotes the category of descent data with respect to $I^\dagger((U_{\widetilde{Y}^{\langle m\rangle}}, \widetilde{Y}^{\langle m\rangle})/\mathcal{S}_K)$ $(m = 0, 1, 2)$. Now let us recall that the category of overconvergent isocrystals satisfies the descent property for strict etale hypercoverings ([S3, 5.1]) and strict proper Čech hypercoverings (Proposition 7.3). So it satisfies the descent property for Čech hypercoverings constructed from a morphism which is the composite of a strict etale covering and a strict proper covering. Hence we have an equivalence of categories

$$I^\dagger((U_{\widetilde{Y}}, \widetilde{Y})/\mathcal{S}_K) \xrightarrow{=} I^\dagger((U_{\widetilde{Y}^{\langle m\rangle}}, \widetilde{Y}^{\langle m\rangle})/\mathcal{S}_K), \tag{7.9}$$

that is, $\mathcal{F}^{\langle\bullet\rangle}$ descents to an overconvergent isocrystal on $(U_{\widetilde{Y}^{\langle m\rangle}}, \widetilde{Y}^{\langle m\rangle})/\mathcal{S}$, which we denote by $\mathcal{F}$.

By definition, $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies the required property when $(Z, \overline{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ is equal to $(U_{\widetilde{Y}^{\langle m\rangle}}, \widetilde{Y}^{\langle m\rangle}, \mathcal{Y}^{\langle m\rangle})$ $(m \in \mathbb{N})$. By the descent property (7.9), this property characterizes $\mathcal{F}$. So we have the uniqueness of $\mathcal{F}$.

Finally we check that $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies the required property. When a triple $(Z, \overline{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ as in the statement of the theorem is given, we have the diagram

$$(Z, \overline{Z}) \longleftarrow (X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z}) = (U_{\widetilde{X}} \times_{U_{\widetilde{Y}}} Z, \widetilde{X} \times_{\widetilde{Y}} \overline{Z}) \longleftarrow (U_{\widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)}} \times_{U_{\widetilde{Y}^{(\bullet)}}} Z, \widetilde{X}^{(\bullet)} \times_{\widetilde{Y}^{(\bullet)}} \overline{Z})$$

and for each $n \leq N$, the morphism $(U_{\widetilde{X}^{(n)}} \times_{U_{\widetilde{Y}^{(n)}}} Z, \widetilde{X}^{(n)} \times_{\widetilde{Y}^{(n)}} \overline{Z}) \longrightarrow (Z, \overline{Z})$ admits log structure (the pull-back log structures from $\widetilde{X}^{(n)}, \widetilde{Y}$) which makes this morphism a proper log smooth integral morphism having log smooth parameter. So we have the coherence of $R^q f_{(X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}$ and $R^q f_{(X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}\times_{\mathcal{S}}\mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}$, by the argument using spectral sequence like (7.8). Then, by [T3, 2.3.1], we see that the restriction of $\mathcal{F}$ to $I^\dagger((Z, \overline{Z})/\mathcal{S}_K)$ is given by $(R^q f_{(X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}, \epsilon)$, which is as in the statement of the theorem. The functoriality of this expression can be shown in the same way as Theorem 5.2 (see [S3, 4.8]). So we are done. □

Remark 7.5. By looking at the proof carefully, we see the following: in Theorem 7.4, we can take U_Y to be open dense in $\overline{Y}$ when $Y \subseteq \overline{Y}$ is open dense.

By using the above theorem, we can prove the following theorem, which gives the affirmative answer to Conjecture 0.2 (the version without Frobenius structure) in the case $\mathcal{S} = \mathrm{Spf}\, V$ and Y is smooth over k.

Theorem 7.6. *Let V be a complete discrete valuation ring of mixed characteristic with residue field k and put $S := \operatorname{Spec} k, \mathcal{S} := \operatorname{Spf} V$. Let us assume given the diagram*

$$(X, \overline{X}) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, \overline{Y}) \xrightarrow{g} (S, S), \tag{7.10}$$

where f is a strict proper morphism of pairs such that $f|_X : X \longrightarrow Y$ is proper smooth, Y is smooth over k and g is a morphism of pairs. Then, there exists a non-empty open set U_Y of Y and a diagram

$$\overline{Y} \xleftarrow{g_Y} \widetilde{Y} \overset{i}{\hookrightarrow} \mathcal{Y}$$

(*where g_Y is a composition of an etale surjective map and a proper map and i is a closed immersion into a p-adic formal scheme formally smooth over $\mathcal{S}$*) *such that, for an overconvergent isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ on $(X, \overline{X})/\mathcal{S}_K$* (*which is automatically locally free*) *and $q \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists the unique overconvergent isocrystal $\mathcal{F}$ on $(Y, \overline{Y})/\mathcal{S}_K$ satisfying the following condition*: *For any triple $(Z, \overline{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ over $(Y \times_{\overline{Y}} \widetilde{Y}, \widetilde{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ satisfying either $\overline{Z} = Y \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z}$ or $Z = U_Y \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z}$ with $\mathcal{Z}$ formally smooth over $\mathcal{Y}$, the restriction of $\mathcal{F}$ to $I^\dagger((Z, \overline{Z})/\mathcal{S}_K, \mathcal{Z})$ is given functorially by $(R^q f_{X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*} \mathcal{E}, \epsilon)$, where ϵ is an isomorphism*

$$p_2^* R^q f_{(X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*} \mathcal{E} \overset{\sim}{\to} R^q f_{(X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z} \times_{\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*} \mathcal{E} \overset{\sim}{\leftarrow} p_1^* R^q f_{(X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*} \mathcal{E}$$

(*p_i denotes the i-th projection $]\overline{Z}[_{\mathcal{Z} \times_{\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{Z}} \longrightarrow]\overline{Z}[_{\mathcal{Z}}$*).

Proof. First, let $\overline{Y}'$ be the closure of Y in $\overline{Y}$ and put $\overline{X}' := \overline{Y}' \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{X}$. Then we have the equivalences of categories

$$I^\dagger((X, \overline{X})/\mathcal{S}_K) \cong I^\dagger((X, \overline{X}')/\mathcal{S}_K), \quad I^\dagger((Y, \overline{Y})/\mathcal{S}_K) \cong I^\dagger((Y, \overline{Y}')/\mathcal{S}_K).$$

So we may replace $\overline{X}, \overline{Y}$ by $\overline{X}', \overline{Y}'$ to prove the theorem, that is, we may assume that Y is dense in $\overline{Y}$.

By Theorem 7.4 and Remark 7.5, there exists an open subset $U_Y \subseteq Y$ dense in $\overline{Y}$ and a diagram

$$\overline{Y} \xleftarrow{g_Y} \widetilde{Y} \overset{i}{\hookrightarrow} \mathcal{Y}$$

(where g_Y is a composition of an etale surjective map and a proper surjective map and i is a closed immersion into a p-adic formal scheme formally smooth over $\mathcal{S}$) and the unique overconvergent isocrystal $\mathcal{F}_1$ on $(U_Y, \overline{Y})/\mathcal{S}_K$ such that, for any triples $(Z, \overline{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ over $(Y \times_{\overline{Y}} \widetilde{Y}, \widetilde{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ satisfying $Z = U_Y \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z}$ with $\mathcal{Z}$ formally smooth over $\mathcal{Y}$, the restriction of $\mathcal{F}_1$ to $I^\dagger((Z, \overline{Z})/\mathcal{S}_K, \mathcal{Z})$ is given functorially by $(R^q f_{(X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*} \mathcal{E}, \epsilon)$ as in the statement of the theorem.

On the other hand, by [S3, 5.14] and the descent property of $I^\dagger((Y, Y)/\mathcal{S}_K)$ for etale and proper coverings, we see that there exists the unique overconvergent isocrystal $\mathcal{F}_2$ on $(Y, Y)/\mathcal{S}_K$ such that, for any triples $(Z, \overline{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ over $(Y \times_{\overline{Y}} \widetilde{Y}, \widetilde{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ satisfying $\overline{Z} = Y \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z}$ with $\mathcal{Z}$ formally smooth over $\mathcal{Y}$, the restriction of $\mathcal{F}_2$ to $I^\dagger((Z, \overline{Z})/\mathcal{S}_K, \mathcal{Z})$ is given functorially by $(R^q f_{(X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*} \mathcal{E}, \epsilon)$ as in the statement of the theorem. (In fact, the unique existence of the restriction of $\mathcal{F}_2$

to $I^\dagger((Y \times_{\overline{Y}} \widetilde{Y}, Y \times_{\overline{Y}} \widetilde{Y})/\mathcal{S}_K)$ follows from [S3, 5.14] and we can descent it to $\mathcal{F}_2 \in I^\dagger((Y,Y)/K)$ by using the descent property.)

Let us denote the restriction of $\mathcal{F}_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$ to $I^\dagger((U_Y, Y)/K)$ by $\mathcal{F}'_i$. Then, for any triple $(Z, \overline{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ over $(Y \times_{\overline{Y}} \widetilde{Y}, \widetilde{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ satisfying $Z = U_Y \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z}$ and $\overline{Z} = Y \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z}$ with $\mathcal{Z}$ formally smooth over $\mathcal{Y}$, the restriction of $\mathcal{F}'_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$ to $I^\dagger((Z, \overline{Z})/\mathcal{S}_K, \mathcal{Z})$ are both given functorially by $(R^q f_{(X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*} \mathcal{E}, \epsilon)$ as in the statement of the theorem. Moreover, the above condition charaterizes the overconvergent isocrystals $\mathcal{F}'_i$ because of the descent property of $I^\dagger((U_Y, Y)/K)$ for Čech hypercoverings constructed from a morphism which is the composite of a strict etale covering and a strict strongly proper covering. So we have the canonical isomorphism $\mathcal{F}'_1 \cong \mathcal{F}'_2$. Then, by [Ke1, 5.3.7], we see that there exists uniquely an overconvergent isocrystal $\mathcal{F}$ on $(Y, \overline{Y})/\mathcal{S}_K$ whose restriction to $I^\dagger((U, \overline{Y})/\mathcal{S}_K)$ (resp. $I^\dagger((Y, Y)/\mathcal{S}_K)$) is equal to $\mathcal{F}_1$ (resp. $\mathcal{F}_2$). One can see easily that $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies the required property. The uniqueness of $\mathcal{F}$ follows from that of $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$. So we are done. □

Let us recall the following conjecture by Tsuzuki ([T1, 1.2.1]):

Conjecture 7.7 (Tsuzuki)**.** *Let X be a smooth separated k-scheme of finite type and let $X \hookrightarrow \overline{X}$ be an open immersion such that X is dense in $\overline{X}$. Then the restriction functor*

$$I^\dagger((X, \overline{X})/\mathcal{S}_K) \longrightarrow I^\dagger((X, X)/\mathcal{S}_K) \tag{7.11}$$

is fully faithful.

If we admit this conjecture, we can drop the condition 'Y is smooth' in Theorem 7.6:

Theorem 7.8. *Let us admit the validity of Conjecture 7.7. Let us put $S := \mathrm{Spec}\, k, \mathcal{S} := \mathrm{Spf}\, V$ and let us assume given the diagram*

$$(X, \overline{X}) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, \overline{Y}) \xrightarrow{g} (S, S),$$

where f is a strict proper morphism of pairs such that $f|_X : X \longrightarrow Y$ is proper smooth and g is a morphism of pairs (*but Y is not necessarily smooth*)*. Then the same conclusion as Theorem 7.6 holds.*

Proof. We may assume that Y is dense in $\overline{Y}$. By Theorem 7.4 and Remark 7.5, we have an open subset $U \subseteq Y$ dense in $\overline{Y}$, proper surjective morphism $\overline{Y}^{\langle 0 \rangle} \longrightarrow \overline{Y}$, an etale surjective morphism $\widetilde{Y} \longrightarrow \overline{Y}^{\langle 0 \rangle}$, a closed immersion $\widetilde{Y} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ of $\widetilde{Y}$ into a formal $\mathcal{B}$-scheme formally smooth over $\mathcal{S}$ such that, for any overconvergent isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ on $(X, \overline{X})/\mathcal{S}_K$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists the unique overconvergent isocrystal $\mathcal{F}_1$ on $(U, \overline{Y})/K$ satisfying the following condition: For any triple $(Z, \overline{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ over $(Y \times_{\overline{Y}} \widetilde{Y}, \widetilde{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ satisfying $Z = U \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z}$ with $\mathcal{Z}$ formally smooth over $\mathcal{Y}$, the restriction of $\mathcal{F}_1$ to $I^\dagger((Z, \overline{Z})/\mathcal{S}_K, \mathcal{Z})$ is given functorially by $(R^q f_{(X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*} \mathcal{E}, \epsilon)$ as in the statement of the theorem. By Theorem 6.11 and the proof of Theorem 7.4, we can take $\overline{Y}^{\langle 0 \rangle}$ and U in order that $\overline{Y}^{\langle 0 \rangle}$ is smooth over k and $U \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Y}^{\langle 0 \rangle}$ is dense open in $\overline{Y}^{\langle 0 \rangle}$.

On the other hand, let $Y^{\langle 0\rangle}$ be the inverse image of Y in $\overline{Y}^{\langle 0\rangle}$. Since $Y^{\langle 0\rangle}$ is smooth over k, there exists (by [S3, 5.14] and Proposition 7.3) the unique overconvergent isocrystal $\mathcal{F}_2^{\langle 0\rangle}$ on $(Y^{\langle 0\rangle}, Y^{\langle 0\rangle})/\mathcal{S}_K$ such that, for any triple $(Z, \overline{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ over $(Y \times_{\overline{Y}} \widetilde{Y}, \widetilde{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ satisfying $\overline{Z} = Y \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z}$ with $\mathcal{Z}$ formally smooth over $\mathcal{Y}$, the restriction of $\mathcal{F}_2^{\langle 0\rangle}$ to $I^{\dagger}((Z, \overline{Z})/\mathcal{S}_K, \mathcal{Z})$ is given functorially by $(R^q f_{(X\times_Y Z, \overline{X}\times_{\overline{Y}}\overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}, \epsilon)$ as in the statement of the theorem. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $Y^{\langle 0\rangle, m}$ be the m-fold fiber product of $Y^{\langle 0\rangle}$ over Y. Then, since the morphism $\overline{X}\times_{\overline{Y}} Y^{\langle 0\rangle, m} \longrightarrow Y^{\langle 0\rangle, m}$ has log smooth parameter, we can prove (again by [S3, 5.14] and Proposition 7.3) the unique existence of overconvergent isocrystals $\mathcal{F}_2^{\langle 0\rangle, m}$ on $(Y^{\langle 0\rangle, m}, Y^{\langle 0\rangle, m})/\mathcal{S}_K$ $(m \in \mathbb{N})$ which is compatible with respect to m. Hence, by descent property of overconvergent isocrystals with respect to the proper covering $Y^{\langle 0\rangle, m} \longrightarrow Y$, we see that the family $\{\mathcal{F}_2^{\langle 0\rangle, m}\}_{m=1,2,3}$ descents to the overconvergent isocrystal on $(Y, Y)/\mathcal{S}_K$, which we denote by $\mathcal{F}_2$.

Let us denote the restriction of $\mathcal{F}_i\,(i = 1, 2)$ to $I^{\dagger}((U, Y)/\mathcal{S}_K)$ by $\mathcal{F}'_i$. Then, we can see the following in the same way as the proof of Theorem 7.6: For any triple $(Z, \overline{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ over $(Y \times_{\overline{Y}} \widetilde{Y}, \widetilde{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ satisfying $Z = U \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z}$ and $\overline{Z} = Y \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z}$ with $\mathcal{Z}$ formally smooth over $\mathcal{Y}$, the restriction of $\mathcal{F}'_i\,(i = 1, 2)$ to $I^{\dagger}((Z, \overline{Z})/\mathcal{S}_K, \mathcal{Z})$ are both given functorially by $(R^q f_{(X\times_Y Z, \overline{X}\times_{\overline{Y}}\overline{Z})/\mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}, \epsilon)$ as in the statement of Theorem 7.6. This implies that there exists the canonical isomorphism $\mathcal{F}'_1 \cong \mathcal{F}'_2$. So it suffices to prove that the functor

(7.12)
$$\phi : I^{\dagger}((Y, \overline{Y})/\mathcal{S}_K) \longrightarrow I^{\dagger}((U, \overline{Y})/\mathcal{S}_K) \times_{I^{\dagger}((U,Y)/K)} I^{\dagger}((Y, Y)/\mathcal{S}_K)$$

induced by the restriction functors is an equivalence of categories. Note that we can take (by using the results in [dJ]) a split proper hypercovering $\overline{Y} \longleftarrow \overline{Y}^{\langle\bullet\rangle}$ such that $\overline{Y}^{\langle 0\rangle}$ is given as above and that each $\overline{Y}^{\langle m\rangle}$ is smooth over k. Let $Y^{\langle\bullet\rangle}, U^{\langle\bullet\rangle}$ be the inverse image of Y, U in $\overline{Y}^{\langle\bullet\rangle}$, respectively. Then, by proper descent (Proposition 7.3) of overconvergent isocrystals and [SD, (3.3.4.2)], the restriction functor

$$I^{\dagger}((P, Q)/\mathcal{S}_K) \longrightarrow I^{\dagger}((P^{\langle\bullet\rangle}, Q^{\langle\bullet\rangle})/\mathcal{S}_K) \tag{7.13}$$

for $(P, Q) = (Y, \overline{Y}), (U, \overline{Y}), (Y, Y), (U, Y)$ are equivelences of categories, where $I^{\dagger}((P^{\langle\bullet\rangle}, Q^{\langle\bullet\rangle})/\mathcal{S}_K)$ denotes the category of descent data with respect to $I^{\dagger}((P^{\langle m\rangle}, Q^{\langle m\rangle})/\mathcal{S}_K)$ $(m = 0, 1, 2)$. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let us denote the functor

$$I^{\dagger}((Y^{\langle m\rangle}, \overline{Y}^{\langle m\rangle})/K) \longrightarrow I^{\dagger}((U^{\langle m\rangle}, \overline{Y}^{\langle m\rangle})/K) \times_{I^{\dagger}((U^{\langle m\rangle}, Y^{\langle m\rangle})/K)} I^{\dagger}((Y^{\langle m\rangle}, Y^{\langle m\rangle})/K)$$

by $\phi^{\langle m\rangle}$. Then, by the equivalence of categories (7.13), it suffices to prove that $\phi^{\langle 0\rangle}$ is an equivalence of categories and that $\phi^{\langle m\rangle}$ is fully faithful for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ to prove the equivalence of ϕ.

First, $\phi^{\langle 0\rangle}$ is an equivalence of categories by [Ke1, 5.3.7], since $\overline{Y}^{\langle 0\rangle}$ is smooth over k and $U^{\langle 0\rangle}$ is dense open in $\overline{Y}^{\langle 0\rangle}$. Next, let us prove the full-faithfulness of $m \geq 1$. Since $\overline{Y}^{\langle m\rangle}$ is smooth over k, we may consider connected componentwise. So we may assume that $\overline{Y}^{\langle m\rangle}$ is connected. Then, if $U^{\langle m\rangle}$ is non-empty, it is dense in $\overline{Y}^{\langle m\rangle}$. In this case, $\phi^{\langle m\rangle}$ is an equivalence of categories by [Ke1, 5.3.7]. On the other hand, if

$U^{\langle m\rangle}$ is empty, then $\phi^{\langle m\rangle}$ is fully-faithful by Conjecture 7.7. So $\phi^{\langle m\rangle}$ is fully faithful for $m \geq 1$, and the proof of the theorem is now finished. □

Next we give a result on Frobenius structure on the overconvergent isocrystal constructed in Theorems 5.2, 7.4, 7.6.

Let V be a complete discrete valuation ring of mixed characteristic with perfect residue field k, let π be a uniformizer of V and put $\mathcal{S} := \operatorname{Spf} V$, $S := \operatorname{Spec} V/\pi V = B$. Let us fix an integer q which is a power of p. For a scheme X over $\mathbb{F}_p$, let F_X be the q-th power Frobenius (the morphism induced by q-th power endomorphism of structure sheaf). Assume that we have an endomorphism $\sigma : \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}$ which lifts $F_S : S \longrightarrow S$ and fix it. Then, if we have a morphism of pairs $(X, \overline{X}) \xrightarrow{f} (S, S)$, we have the canonical functor

$$F_X^* : I^\dagger((X, \overline{X})/\mathcal{S}_K) \longrightarrow I^\dagger((X, \overline{X})/\mathcal{S}_K)$$

induced by the morphisms $F_{\overline{X}}$ and σ. An overconvergent F-isocrystal on $(X, \overline{X})/\mathcal{S}_K)$ is defined to be a pair $(\mathcal{E}, \alpha)$, where $\mathcal{E}$ is an overconvergent isocrystal on $(X, \overline{X})/\mathcal{S}_K$ and α is an isomorphism $F_X^*\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{E}$ (which we call a Frobenius structure on $\mathcal{E}$). Then we have the following:

Theorem 7.9. *Let the notations be as in Theorem 5.2, Theorem 7.4 or Theorem 7.6. Assume moreover that* $\mathcal{S} = \operatorname{Spf} V, S = \operatorname{Spec} k$ (V *is as above*) *and that we have a fixed endomorphism* $\sigma : \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}$ *which lifts* $F_S : S \longrightarrow S$*. Then, if* $\mathcal{E}$ *has a Frobenius structure,* $\mathcal{F}$ *in the theorem has a canonical Frobenius structure induced from that on* $\mathcal{E}$*.*

Proof. Since the proof is quite similar to that of [S3, 5.16], we only give a sketch: we are reduced to proving that, for any $(Z, \overline{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ as in the statement of Theorem 5.2, 7.4 or 7.6 endowed with an endomorphism $\sigma_{\mathcal{Z}} : \mathcal{Z} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ compatible with $F_{\overline{Z}}$ and σ, there exists a functorial Frobenius structure on the restriction $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{Z}}$ of $\mathcal{F}$ to $I^\dagger((Z, \overline{Z})/\mathcal{S}_K, \mathcal{Z})$. To simplify the notation, we replace $(Z, \overline{Z}, \mathcal{Z}), (X \times_Y Z, \overline{X} \times_{\overline{Y}} \overline{Z}), \sigma_{\mathcal{Z}}$ by $(Y, \overline{Y}, \mathcal{Y}), (X, \overline{X}), \sigma_{\mathcal{Y}}$, respectively. Then we have the canonical homomorphism

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{Y}}^* R^q f_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{F^*} R^q f_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{rig}*} F_X^*\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\alpha} R^q f_{(X,\overline{X})/\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{rig}*}\mathcal{E}.$$

(where F^* is induced by $F_{\overline{X}}^*$ and $\sigma_{\mathcal{Y}}$). We can prove that it is an isomorphism in exactly the same way as [S3, 5.16]. □

Using Theorem 7.9, we can prove the following theorem, which gives the affirmative answer to Conjecture 0.2 (the version with Frobenius structure) in the case $\mathcal{S} = \operatorname{Spf} V$. (This is the 'Frobenius version' of Theorem 7.8, but we do not assume Conjecture 7.7 here):

Theorem 7.10. *Let* $S := \operatorname{Spec} k, \mathcal{S} := \operatorname{Spf} V$ *and let us fix an endomorphism* $\sigma : \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}$ *which lifts* $F_S : S \longrightarrow S$*. Let us assume given the diagram*

$$(X, \overline{X}) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, \overline{Y}) \xrightarrow{g} (S, S),$$

where f is a strict proper morphism of pairs such that $f|_X : X \longrightarrow Y$ is proper smooth and g is a morphism of pairs Then, for an overconvergent F-isocrystal $\mathcal{E}$ on $(X, \overline{X})/\mathcal{S}_K$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$, the same conclusion as Theorem 7.6 holds and $\mathcal{F}$ has a canonical Frobenius structure induced by that on $\mathcal{E}$.

Proof. We may assume that Y is dense in $\overline{Y}$. Let the notations be as in the proof of Theorem 7.8. Then the argument in the proof of Theorems 7.8, 7.9 shows that there exists a canonical Frobenius structure on $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ with the isomorphism $\mathcal{F}_1' \cong \mathcal{F}_2'$ as overconvergent F-isocrystals. Let us denote the category of overconvergent F-isocrystals on a pair (P, Q) by $F\text{-}I^\dagger((P,Q)/\mathcal{S}_K)$. Then it suffices to prove that the restriction functor

$$\phi : F\text{-}I^\dagger((Y,\overline{Y})/\mathcal{S}_K) \longrightarrow F\text{-}I^\dagger((U,\overline{Y})/\mathcal{S}) \times_{F\text{-}I^\dagger((U,Y)/\mathcal{S}_K)} F\text{-}I^\dagger((Y,Y)/\mathcal{S}_K)$$

is an equivalence of categories. Note that, for a smooth separated k-scheme Z and a dense open immersion $Z \hookrightarrow \overline{Z}$, the restriction functor

$$F\text{-}I^\dagger((Z,\overline{Z})/\mathcal{S}_K) \longrightarrow F\text{-}I^\dagger((Z,Z)/\mathcal{S}_K)$$

is known to be fully faithful [Ke3], [Ke2, 4.2.1]. So we see that the functor

$$\begin{aligned}\phi^{\langle m\rangle} :& F\text{-}I^\dagger((Y^{\langle m\rangle},\overline{Y}^{\langle m\rangle})/\mathcal{S}_K) \\ &\longrightarrow F\text{-}I^\dagger((U^{\langle m\rangle},\overline{Y}^{\langle m\rangle})/\mathcal{S}) \times_{F\text{-}I^\dagger((U^{\langle m\rangle},Y^{\langle m\rangle})/\mathcal{S}_K)} F\text{-}I^\dagger((Y^{\langle m\rangle},Y^{\langle m\rangle})/\mathcal{S}_K)\end{aligned}$$

is an equivalence of categories for $m = 0$ by [Ke1, 5.3.7] and it is fully-faithful in general. (See the proof of Theorem 7.8. Here we do not use Conjecture 7.7 because we use the above-mentioned result of Kedlaya instead of Conjecture 7.7.) From this fact, we can deduce that ϕ is an equivalence. So we are done. □

References

[A-Kar] D, Abramovich and K. Karu, *Weak semistable reduction in characteristic 0*, Invent math. **139**(2000), 241–273.

[B1] P. Berthelot, *Cohomologie cristalline des schémas de caractéristique* $p > 0$, Lecture Note in Math. **407**, Springer-Verlag (1974).

[B2] P. Berthelot, *Géométrie Rigide et Cohomologie des Variétés Algébriques de Caractéristique p*, Bull. Soc. Math. de France, Mémoire **23**(1986), 7–32.

[B3] P. Berthelot, *Cohomologie rigide et cohomologie rigide à supports propres première partie*, prépublication de l'IRMAR 96-03.

[B4] P. Berthelot, *Finitude et pureté cohomologique en cohomologie rigide*, Invent. Math., **128**(1997), 329–377.

[B-O] P. Berthelot and A. Ogus, *Notes on Crystalline Cohomology*, Mathematical Notes, Princeton University Press, 1978.

[Ch-T] B. Chiarellotto and N. Tsuzuki, *Cohomological descent of rigid cohomology for etale coverings*, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova, **109**(2003), 63–215.

[Cr] R. Crew, *Crystalline cohomology of singular varieties*, in Geometric Aspects of Dwork Theory, 451–462.

[E] J.-E. Etesse, *Descente étale des F-isocristaux surconvergents et rationalité des fonctions L de schémas abéliens*, Ann. Sci. Ec. Norm. Sup. **35**(2002), 575–603.

[dJ] A. J. de Jong, *Smoothness, semi-stability and alterations*, Publ. Math. IHES, **83**(1996), 51–93.

[dJ2] A. J. de Jong, *Families of curves and alterations*, Ann. Inst. Fourier, **47**(1997), 599–621.

[Kat] K. Kato, *Logarithmic Structures of Fontaine-Illusie*, in Algebraic Analysis, Geometry, and Number Theory, J-I.Igusa ed., 1988, Johns Hopkins University, pp. 191–224.

[Ke1] K. S. Kedlaya, *Semistable reduction for overconvergent F-isocrystals, I: Unipotence and logarithmic extensions*, Compositio Math., **143**(2007), 1164–1212.

[Ke2] K. S. Kedlaya, *Semistable reduction for overconvergent F-isocrystals, II: A valuation-theoretic approach*, to appear in Compositio Math.

[Ke3] K. S. Kedlaya, *Full faithfulness for overconvergent F-isocrystals*, Geometric Aspects of Dwork Theory, Walter de Gruyter, 819–835 (2004).

[N-S] Y. Nakkajima and A. Shiho, *Weight-filtered convergent complex*, preprint.

[O1] A. Ogus, *F-isocrystals and de Rham Cohomology II — Convergent Isocrystals*, Duke Math. J., **51**(1984), 765–850.

[O2] A. Ogus, *The Convergent Topos in Characteristic p*, in Grothendieck Festschrift, Progress in Math., Birkhäuser.

[O3] A. Ogus, *F-crystals, Griffiths transversality, and the Hodge decomposition*, Astérisque **221**, 1994.

[SD] B. Saint-Donat, *Techniques de descente cohomologique*, Exposé V bis in Théorie des topos et cohomologie étale des schémas, Lecture Note in Math. **270**, Springer-Verlag.

[S1] A. Shiho, *Crystalline Fundamental Groups I — Isocrystals on Log Crystalline Site and Log Convergent Site*, J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo, **7**(2000), 509–656.

[S2] A. Shiho, *Crystalline fundamental groups II — Log convergent cohomology and rigid cohomology.* J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo, **9**(2002), 1–163.

[S3] A. Shiho, *Relative log convergent cohomology and relative rigid cohomology I*, preprint.

[T1] N. Tsuzuki, *Morphisms of F-isocrystals and the finite monodromy theoerem for unit-root F-isocrystals*, Duke Math J. **111**(2002), 385–419.

[T2] N. Tsuzuki, *On the Gysin isomorphism of rigid cohomology*, Hiroshima Math. J., **29**(1999), 479–527.

[T3] N. Tsuzuki, *On base change theorem and coherence in rigid cohomology*, Documenta Math., Extra Volume Kato (2003), 891–918.

[T4] N. Tsuzuki, *Cohomological descent of rigid cohomology for proper coverings*, Invent. Math. **151**(2003), 101-133.

[T5] N. Tsuzuki, *Cohomological descent in rigid cohomology*, in Geometric Aspects of Dwork Theory, Walter de Gruyter, 931-981 (2004).

Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Tokyo, 3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8914, JAPAN.